

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

'THE real atheist or total unbeliever is a man born God-blind or God-deaf. He is no more able to accept the supernatural than the music-deaf man is able to comprehend the meaning of a symphony of Beethoven or the colour-blind man to criticize a canvas of Raphael or Rubens. He stands before a page of Isaiah or Daniel, exactly in the same difficulty as my friend was in when he stood in the porch of his residence, and is equally insensible of his loss, save that the latter has learned that there is some defect in his vision which he cannot entirely comprehend, whilst the former is quite satisfied that the accumulated testimony of countless millions of Christians in all ages is the result of a delusion produced by credulous expounders of a fraudulent Bible; firm in his one religious belief that he alone with his few spiritually blind brethren is the only true interpreter of the Divine Will as revealed to His chosen people in the sacred oracles of God.'

That is a serious statement. Can a more serious statement be made? Who makes it? It is made by a very distinguished man of science. A new edition of *Sir Isaac Newton's Daniel and the Apocalypse* has been published (John Murray; 15s. net), edited by Sir William WHITLA, M.P., M.D., D.Sc., LL.D. And the editor prefixes a long introduction, in which he discusses 'the nature and the cause of unbelief.' In that introduction

Sir William WHITLA makes the assertion that some men are born God-blind.

He refers to a friend of his who is colour-blind. He does not give his name, but calls him 'a highly intellectual Christian gentleman whom I have very intimately known for many years.' 'One bright autumn day we were standing in the porch of his house on a pavement of richly coloured encaustic tiles, when it occurred to me to try a very simple experiment by way of a test. There was a glorious blue tile at his feet, and plucking a single leaf of the small-leaved Virginia creeper of the brightest vermilion red, I placed it in the centre of the blue tile and asked him what he had to say about their colours. He laughed heartily and exclaimed, "Doctor, you have made a mistake this time; you thought to catch me, but this is a leaf and therefore I know it must be green." "But what about the colour of the tile?" "It is the same," he said, "as the leaf, only one is a little darker or lighter than the other; now when I look closely at them I think they are of the same colour which my wife called grey when she was showing me some ribbons lately."

As this man is colour-blind, so, says Sir William WHITLA, another man is God-blind. And without any fault of his own. He was born so. The knowledge of God is a gift of

God. It is given to one man, from another it is withheld.

There are degrees of God-blindness. Some men, says Sir William WHITLA, are totally God-blind. These are they 'who go the entire length of denying the existence of a personal God and Saviour.' 'There are others (like the colour-blind individual, who is able to recognize some primary colours, or like the partially music-deaf man who can imperfectly learn a few tunes) who have some belief in an all-wise Deity, but who are incapable of believing in the inspiration of the Bible. Others there are again whose faith may be equal to accepting the reality of God and inspiration or prophecy, but are wholly incapable of conceiving of the possibility of miracle, and so on through the entire gamut of infidelity from atheism to deism, agnosticism, rationalism, materialism, free-thought, and the minor or more diluted and fanciful varieties of Unbelief as the fashionable clerical type masking under the name of Modernism.'

Is the God-blind man responsible for his blindness? He is not. There is nothing about which Sir William WHITLA is more emphatic than that. 'The God-blind man is probably an honest man, and I am convinced he is generally acting according to his light and with the aim which he thinks is the spread of what he calls "truth."' He is born God-blind, and it demands a Calvinism higher (more *hyper*) than even Sir William WHITLA's to believe that we are responsible for our birth.

Can God-blindness be cured? Again Sir William WHITLA is emphatic. It cannot be cured. 'Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born blind' (Jn 9³²). Since the world began was it not heard that any man opened the eyes of one that was born God-blind.

It has often been tried. It has never been successful. For 'if you approach a typical sceptic

by the ordinary methods of argument and reasoning and strive to convince him that everything in the world around him and in the heavens above him proclaims the reality and the existence of a personal God, he only laughs at you or pities your credulity and ignorance. He tells you, as he tells himself, that he sees all these things and that his own reasoning powers are quite as good as your own (indeed, he is almost certain to feel that his are better since he has probably accepted reason as his sole deity), and he will tell you that, having examined every theological argument, he has thoroughly convinced himself irrevocably by his reason that there is no proof of such a doctrine. Against the weapons of the Christian's reasoning and experience he is clad in triple mail.'

The problem which Sir William WHITLA has stated so unreservedly is dealt with also in a book which is noticed on another page—Bishop Arthur CHANDLER'S *First-Hand Religion* (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net). 'First-Hand Religion' is Bishop CHANDLER'S name for what we know as mysticism. And the question he asks is whether mysticism 'is the exclusive prerogative of a special sort of temperament, in such a sense that people of a different temperament are precluded from experiencing it.'

Now, we may be sure that if any man may be a mystic, any man may be a believer in God. For the mystic, in Bishop CHANDLER'S idea and in ours, is the religious man at his most religiousness. Does Bishop CHANDLER believe that any man may be a mystic?

He does. God, he says, is willing to reveal Himself to any man. If a man is not a mystic, in other words, if a man does not find God, it is not because God has made him so that he is incapable of finding God, it is because he does not 'put himself into the right disposition to receive His revelations.' 'It is not people who are specially chosen by Him, or people who have a particular

psychic-physical temperament, that are recipients of His revelation, but those who wait for it with open and teachable minds.'

Messrs. Chapman & Hall have sent out a new edition of Mr. Gilbert THOMAS'S *Things Big and Little* (3s. 6d. net). Of the numerous volumes of essays on all sorts of subjects which are keeping the printers at work it is one of the least eccentric, and most spiritually strengthening. Among the essays there is 'A Word on Prayer.'

It is the old question whether prayer for material things is of any avail. But it is not pursued in the old way. To Mr. THOMAS the question is not will prayer for material things be answered, but should prayer for material things be offered.

He goes to Meredith—'by common consent among the greatest and best of men (though a recent biography has sought to modify the impression).' Meredith says bluntly, 'Prayer for material things is worse than useless; prayer for strength of soul alone avails.' But that is too dogmatic, says Mr. THOMAS. It is more than dogmatic, it is off the point. The question is not whether prayer for material things is useful or useless, it is whether it should be offered.

For prayer may be answered even when it should not have been offered. You remember that terrible sentence in one of the psalms (106^{14, 15}), 'They lusted exceedingly in the wilderness, and tempted God in the desert. *And he gave them their request, and sent leanness into their soul.*' They who made that prayer had their answer. They received the very things they prayed for. But it would have been better for them if they had not received them.

Was the fault with God? The fault was clearly with them. The alternative for God was to let them perish in the wilderness. And that could

not be. Moses reminded God once that that could not be. The faithfulness of God would have been discredited. His very power would have been doubted. They had to get what they prayed for. But they should not have prayed for it.

Why should they not have prayed for it? Because it was a material thing? Not so. Certainly not so. Christ taught His disciples to pray for material things. 'Give us this day our daily bread.' There is no more objection to prayer for material things than there is to prayer for spiritual things. '*Whatsoever* ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you.' The question is not whether this thing or that thing should be asked. The question is whether the thing asked is asked 'in my name.' And we know that 'in my name' means according to the will of God.

It is certainly according to the will of God to grant us material things. Every good gift cometh down from above. It is His sun that rises in the morning; it is His rain that descends in the evening. But if the thing is selfish, then whether it is material or spiritual it is not in accordance with the will of God and should not be requested. The only advantage that the spiritual thing has over the material is that it is less likely to be selfish. And yet, how often is prayer offered for increase in spirituality with the half-conscious thought that the increased spirituality will bring increased honour.

The Hartley Lecture for 1922 was delivered by the Rev. Henry J. PICKETT, its subject *The Hebrew Prophet and the Modern Preacher*. Under that title it is now published and makes a volume of nearly three hundred pages (Holborn Publishing House; 5s. net).

The purpose is to magnify the office of the Christian preacher. The method is to show that

the Christian preacher is a prophet. What else he is or ought to be, Mr. PICKETT does not say. This is what he is meant above all else to be.

Now in order to be a prophet just one thing is necessary—personal touch with God. You may call this personal touch by your own name. Mr. PICKETT calls it experience. The preacher must have immediate experience of God. If he has not that, he has nothing, and is not properly a preacher.

For you must preach about God. And you cannot preach another man's experience of God. Only your own experience is preaching. That is what we mean by saying that personality is the telling fact in the pulpit. Personality does not mean eccentricity. It does not mean even individuality. It means such realization of God in one's own life as makes one (to use the ancient epithet) a man of God.

How does this realization of God arrive? Does it come from without or from within? The question is important. For to a wrong answer is due that cleavage in our attitude to Christ which is the most flagrant fact of our present-day Christianity. The Modernist says that it comes from within. What I experience—that, he says, is true. And since I have no experience of Jesus Christ as God, Jesus Christ is not God.

But the first experience of God is not from within. It is from without. So it was with the early disciples. First came Christ in His humanity. He made claims. He claimed to be the Son of God. The disciples accepted the claim. They believed on Him. Then followed the experience within. In the words of Bishop CHANDLER: 'Our Lord's character and life, works and teaching, made an impression on His disciples, a complex impression which, in so far as it caused them to follow Him, was a belief in Him, whether as prophet or Messiah. This belief was not

a mere intellectual assent; it was an act by which they accepted Him as their Master and committed themselves to His service; and this moral and emotional side came gradually to express itself devotionally in prayer and spiritual experience of His power and presence in their lives; but a belief of some sort came first, and made the prayer and spiritual experience possible.'

Mr. PICKETT is of the same mind. You might have feared for him that he would fall into the pit which the Modernists have dug. He is better instructed. 'God,' he says, 'must be known, loved, obeyed. Much will have led to the definite "sense of God," which underlies vocation. What indeed is experience, but the growing force of many rills making up the main current or channel of personality? It is what the New Testament knows as conversion, and the following of Christ. The prophets knew God, not as a doctrine, but as a fact. As they followed their work, as they looked out over the conditions of their time, or as they suffered in their persons and homes, God stood for them as the reality behind, above, and over all. He and His made up for them the supreme concern of life.'

Then came the experience within, and the conviction which only experience within can bring. And out of conviction the constraint. 'Each of them passed through an experience, felt later by the "One greater than a prophet," so that they could have fittingly used His own great speech, "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished." And it is always questionable whether, until this "necessity is laid upon us," and the sense of "woe unto me" is felt, we ought to accept any other standard as constituting the call of God.'

Those are the steps. For it is the Modernist, ever crying out against a cataclysmic religion, who works by cataclysms. The rest recognize progress in the knowledge of Christ. First the fact of a Saviour, next the acceptance of His saving.

power, then the experience of His work within, making for peace and joy, finally the full assurance of faith and the 'woe is me if I preach not the gospel.'

A book which drives one to disturbed thinking comes quietly from the Cambridge University Press, and bears the inoffensive title of *Essays on the Depopulation of Melanesia* (6s. net). The Essays are edited by Dr. W. H. R. RIVERS. Sir Everard im THURN writes a Preface. The essayists are three missionaries (Mr. W. J. DURRAD, Mr. A. I. HOPKINS, and Mr. W. C. O'FERRALL), two Resident Magistrates (Mr. C. M. WOODFORD and the late Sir William MACGREGOR); and a scientific anthropologist (Dr. Felix SPEISER). Dr. RIVERS himself writes the last essay, and carries the disturbance to its height.

What is it all about? It is about the depopulation of Melanesia. It is all about that. The title of the book is descriptive of its contents.

Well, why should Melanesia not be depopulated? What harm will it do if the native tribes of Melanesia diminish in numbers or even vanish off the earth? Will the commerce of the world suffer? These writers are not thinking of commerce. But the Melanesians belong to the coloured races. These writers are not thinking of colour. One and all, they are greatly concerned about the depopulation of Melanesia, and, one and all, it is because they are interested in the Melanesians.

The depopulation is due to Europeans. There may have been a tribe here or a tribe there which was decreasing in number before Europeans came. But the writers agree that the decrease as a whole is due to the effect which the arrival of Europeans has had on the natives. And it is not that the Europeans who have gone to Melanesia have deliberately set themselves to reduce the number of the natives, as has been the case (God forgive us all) in some lands. Alcohol and disease have been introduced, and have called for their victims,

here as everywhere. But the depopulation in its extent and alarm is due to the missionaries and the magistrates.

The missionaries have substituted Christianity for the native religions. The magistrates have prohibited head-hunting. These are the causes of the depopulation which, with one consent, the writers in this book deplore.

Should Christianity not have been introduced into Melanesia? None of the writers says so. Perhaps Sir Everard im THURN would have an open mind. Perhaps Dr. SPEISER, the scientific anthropologist, if pressed, would say it should not. All the rest would affirm that there is no country on the face of the earth which would suffer by the introduction of Christianity.

It is the manner in which Christianity may be introduced into a country; it is the manner in which it has been introduced into Melanesia, that is the trouble. Dr. RIVERS is most explicit.

The chief cause of the depopulation of Melanesia, says Dr. RIVERS, is the lack of interest in life. We shall see what that means in a moment, when we come to head-hunting. For the present the point is that the chief interest of the natives has been a religious interest. And the question is, Will Christianity furnish that interest?

Dr. RIVERS sees no reason why it should not. 'Experience,' he says, 'has amply shown that Christianity is capable of giving the people an interest in life which can take the place of that due to their indigenous religion.' In any case, now that Christianity has come, it has come to stay. Christianity is to be the religion of the Melanesians. For 'even if it were thought desirable to maintain the native religion in a modified form, it is highly improbable that there will be found people of our own culture sufficiently self-sacrificing to guide the progress of the people in the way which comes so naturally to the mission-

aries of the Christian 'religion.' The essential matter is that the indigenous religion must not be displaced in such a way as to destroy the interest of the natives in religion.

Two things are necessary—a united policy and sympathy. Hitherto, says Dr. RIVERS, 'one missionary has seen nothing but the work of the devil in some native institution and has willed its complete destruction; another, perhaps even of the same Mission, has seen in it a means of preparing the ground for the truth, and has, to some extent at least, encouraged its activities.'

This has puzzled the native and has led to dissimulation. 'If a new gospel is to be taken with success to such a people as the Melanesians, it is essential that the indigenous point of view shall be understood and that the misunderstanding to which the new views are inevitably subject shall be appreciated. Even if it were decided utterly to destroy the old religion there is no way in which these difficulties can be met so successfully as by a study of the old religion and of the mental attitude upon which the old religious practices rested, for this attitude must inevitably influence the reception of the new religion. If, on the other hand, it be decided to preserve such elements of the old religion as are not in conflict with the new, this study is even more essential. How can it be possible to decide whether a native practice shall be preserved unless the nature of the practice is thoroughly understood and its relations with other aspects of the native culture realised? Whatever the policy adopted towards the indigenous religion, it is of the utmost importance that this religion shall be understood and that, even if no concerted effort to study native religions is made, attempts in this direction made by individual missionaries shall be encouraged.'

But the chief cause of the depopulation of Melanesia is the prohibition of head-hunting. And the urgent question for missionary and for magistrate is what is to be done about that.

For that practice, says Dr. RIVERS, 'formed the centre of a social and religious institution which took an all-pervading part in the lives of the people. The heads sought in the head-hunting expeditions were needed in order to propitiate the ancestral ghosts on such occasions as building a new house for a chief or making a new canoe, while they were also offered in sacrifice at the funeral of a chief. Moreover, head-hunting was not only necessary for the due performance of the religious rites of the people, but it stood in the closest relation to pursuits of an economic kind. The actual head-hunting expedition only lasted a few weeks, and the actual fighting often only a few hours, but this was only the culminating point of a process lasting over years. It was the rule that new canoes should be made for an expedition to obtain heads, and the manufacture of these meant work of an interesting kind, lasting certainly for many months, probably for years. The process of canoe-building was accompanied throughout by rites and feasts which not only excited the liveliest interest but also acted as stimuli to various activities of horticulture and pig-breeding. As the date fixed for the expedition approached, other rites and feasts were held, and these were still more frequent and on a larger scale after the return of a successful expedition. In stopping the practice of head-hunting the rulers from an alien culture were abolishing an institution which had its roots in the religion of the people and spread its branches throughout nearly every aspect of their culture, and by this action they deprived the people of the greater part of their interest in life.'

Does Dr. RIVERS advocate the restoration of head-hunting? Not exactly. Not just human head-hunting. What he advocates is the gradual modification of the custom of hunting for human heads: He thinks that that should have been done. He thinks it might be done yet.

His words are these: 'At first sight it might seem a hopeless task, and so it would be if one

attended only to the outward practice obvious to the European observer and ignored the meaning which the institution of head-hunting bears to those who practise it. If we turn to this inner meaning, the case becomes less difficult. The essential motive for the head-hunting of Melanesia is the belief that on various important occasions, and especially on occasions connected with the chiefs, a human head is necessary as an offering to the ancestral ghosts. There is little doubt that the custom is a relic of an earlier practice of human sacrifice, and the head-hunting of the Solomons was but little removed from this, for till recently it was the custom to bring home from expeditions captives who were killed when some important ceremony created the need for a head. In other parts of the world there is reason to believe that, where human beings were formerly sacrificed, the place of the human victim has been taken by an animal, and even that the place of a human head has been taken by that of an animal. I have no doubt that it would have been possible to effect such a substitution in the Solomons, that officials with the necessary knowledge of native custom and belief, and with some degree of sympathy with them, could have brought about such a substitution and thus avoided the loss of life and money which has accompanied the suppression of head-hunting in the Solomons. At the

same time they would have kept up the interest of the people in their native institutions until such time as the march of events produced new interests, including new religious interests, connected with the culture which was being brought to bear upon their lives.'

One interest would still have to be provided—the interest of canoe-making. 'The substitution of a porcine for a human head, while satisfying many of the ceremonial needs, would leave no motive for the manufacture of new canoes and the maintenance of this industry. Here it would be necessary to provide some new motive for the making of canoes.' Dr. RIVERS suggests the substitution of canoe races. No doubt in such a substitution the native canoe would be displaced by a boat of European build. But as with religion so also with boat-building. The picturesque canoe would disappear, 'but much as this would be regretted by the anthropologist or the artist, the new boat would be probably fully as efficacious in maintaining interest and zest in life and would thus contribute to the purpose which the writers of this volume have before them. Only, it is essential that the change should grow naturally out of native institutions and should not be forced upon the people without their consent and without any attempt to rouse their interest.'

The Nature of Redemption.

BY THE REVEREND A. E. GARVIE, D.D., PRINCIPAL OF NEW COLLEGE, LONDON.

I.

THE work of Christ can be described in a number of terms—Redemption, Reconciliation, Propitiation—each of which presents some phase of it; but Redemption seems to be the most comprehensive of all, and in expounding it the others will in proper course receive attention.

1. According to Paul's teaching, redemption is deliverance from the guilt of sin, *or the wrath of*

God on sin, the power of sin, or *the flesh*, the *law* as a restraint on, and yet a provocation to, sin, and *death* as the penalty of sin. As such it secures for man forgiveness, holiness, freedom, and blessedness, or, to use more theological terminology, justification, sanctification, emancipation, and glorification. Dealing with these aspects of redemption in the reverse order for a reason which will at once be seen, we may note (1) that the hope of resurrection rooted in the believer's

relation to Christ as the Living Lord robs death of its terrors; (2) that the place of the law in the believer's life is taken by, on the one hand, the new commandment of love to man, and, on the other, the new motive of the constraining love of Christ; (3) that the bondage to the flesh is ended by the believer's personal union with Christ by faith, so that he dies unto sin, and lives unto God in Christ; and (4) that the wrath of God against, the judgment of God on, guilty sinners is not annulled but removed in having its purpose fulfilled in *the righteousness of God*.

2. It is with the exposition of this conception that this article is especially concerned; but before passing from the subject of redemption in its varied aspects, attention may be called to the prominence of the idea of *substitution* in all Paul's thinking about redemption. Christ becomes a curse to redeem men from the curse of the law (Gal 3¹⁸). He is born under the law that He may redeem them that are under the law (4⁴⁻⁵). He comes in the likeness of sinful flesh that He may condemn sin in the flesh (Ro 8³). God made Him sin (*i.e.* treated Him as a sinner) who knew no sin that we might become the righteousness of God in Him (2 Co 5²¹). This righteousness of God is the alternative offered to the judgment of God on sin, the wrath of God against sin.

3. Paul shows *the universal need of redemption* by an inductive proof in Ro 1. 2. and 3, that 'all have sinned, and fall short of the glory of God' (3²⁸), and have been thus 'brought under the judgment of God' (v.¹⁹). They are all *guilty* before God. Against them is revealed the wrath of God (1¹⁸). This conception of the wrath of God is an eschatological conception. The wrath of God is restrained by mercy in the present order: for He 'passes over the sins done aforetime in his forbearance' (3²⁵), and He shows 'the riches of his goodness and forbearance and long suffering' (2⁴). The mercy which spares is not, however, the grace that saves, for that has come only in Christ and His Cross. The wrath will be fully disclosed only in the Day of Judgment. As our thought to-day does not move in the same eschatological framework, we must think of God's judgment as the present reaction of His moral perfection against sin in the physical, social, moral, and religious consequences of sin, and of His wrath as the consummation of

that reaction in His final decisive dealing with sin, whatever that may be.

4. The measure of God's judgment, or man's guilt before God, is not man's sense of his own guilt, for that is altogether inadequate to the actuality. As God sets the standard of what man ought to be, so God also measures the failure of man to reach that standard. Man is guilty, not as he thinks himself, but as he has fallen short of the glory of God, which means either the perfection of God for which man is destined, or God's approval. Man's need of redemption, then, is not to be limited by his sense of that need, but by his failure to fulfil God's purpose for him of likeness to, and fellowship with, Himself. If we are to understand Paul, we must substitute a religious objectivity for a moral subjectivity. It is not man's conscience, but God's purpose for man, that is the standard by which man is to be judged, as needing redemption; that, too, must be the measure of the forgiveness which in Christ is offered to man. A man's personal blameworthiness may be measured by his conscience, but not the guilt before God which God's forgiveness annuls. Accordingly, the sacrifice which saves must not be measured by even the best man's sense of his sinfulness, but by Christ's consciousness as Son of God of what the judgment of the holy love of God is regarding the sin of the race.

II.

1. We must now concentrate our attention on the conception of *the righteousness of God*, which has as its antecedent *the propitiation of Christ's blood*, and as its consequent the *reconciliation* of man with God with the other blessings described in Ro 5¹⁻¹¹, which follow from that *reconciliation*. (a) The righteousness of God is both 'the righteousness valid with God' (Luther) for man's forgiveness, and 'a righteousness agreeable to the nature of God' (Baur) in forgiving. It is not only the divine activity corresponding to the divine attribute, but also the condition before God into which man by that activity is brought when he believes. It is a gift of God to faith, 'the righteousness out of faith' (Ro 10⁶), and is, therefore, not a righteousness which man can acquire for himself by his works (v.³). It is not man's, achieved by works, but God's, bestowed on faith. It is not contrary to God's own character

so to deal with man, for God displays His righteousness in saving man (cf. Ps 36^{6,7} 98² 103⁶). Because God is righteous, and not in spite of His being righteous, He 'reckons righteous him that hath faith in Jesus' (3²⁸). 'God's righteousness may mean His attribute, His exercise of that attribute, and the effect of that exercise in man' (*Century Bible*, Romans, p. 93). The central manifestation of that righteousness is the Cross. (b) As this righteousness of God has been sometimes described as a legal fiction—a make-believe in which God thinks and treats man as other than he is—the misconception must be removed. It is possible only if chapters 3 and 4 are separated from chapter 6, the *legal* from the *mystical* aspect of Paul's theology. In the mystical aspect he is expounding his own personal experience; in the legal he is engaged in an apologetic and controversial task. Both were significant for Paul, but the mystical assuredly had the greater value. We must not separate what Paul only distinguishes. Paul does not represent God as thinking of men who have not kept the law as having met all its demands, as pronouncing any legal judgment upon them as guiltless in respect of the law. Nay, forgiveness involves, and does not exclude, the judgment of guilt. God treats sinners as righteous in withholding punishment and conferring favour, not because they will become righteous by His grace, so anticipating their merits as the ground of His action, but because their faith brings them into such relation to Christ that they will become all that God means them to be. (c) Paul speaks of the righteousness of God instead of forgiveness, as we usually do, for two reasons: *Firstly*, as a Pharisee he desired to attain righteousness—the divine approval of his fidelity to the law—but failed. As a believer, God reckons him as righteous, as by his faith placed in that relation to God which he had vainly striven to attain by the works of the law. He could not, even as a believer, abandon the conviction that righteousness is a necessity, a conviction that every man who takes morality and religion seriously as he did must share with him. *Secondly*, the forgiveness which comes to him in Christ is not a *passing over* of his sins in good nature and moral indifference; it is because Christ is set forth as *propitiatory*, consistent with God's own righteousness, His assertion, vindication, and satisfaction of His own moral

perfection. The law, as the expression of God's righteousness, is not made of none effect through faith, for God's judgment and wrath, as well as His grace, are confirmed and harmonized in His righteousness as revealed in Jesus Christ. Paul's conscience was fully satisfied in God's forgiveness.

2. The consequent of the righteousness of God, or justification by faith, is *reconciliation* between God and man. (a) 'The blissful effects of justification partially possessed and gradually to be realized are reconciliation with God, the enjoyment of God's favour, the gladness inspired by the hope of sharing in the holiness and blessedness of God, and the confirmation of this hope in the endurance of trial cheerfully, and the discipline of character which this endurance involves' (Ro 5¹⁻⁴; see *Century Bible*, Romans, p. 146). These blessings are assured to the believer by God's Spirit filling his heart with the sense of God's love, shown in Christ's death. What God has done in that death is the guarantee that He will do even what may be greater in the life of Christ in the believer. Confident of the future, the believer can now rejoice in this communion with God (vv.⁵⁻¹¹). All this man experiences when his estrangement from God ends, and he gives up his distrust of and disobedience to God. As man's reconciliation with God is a subjective effect of the objective fact of justification, statement passes into appeal in Paul's exposition. Believers are exhorted to have peace with God, and to rejoice in hope of the glory of God, and even in their tribulations (vv.¹⁻³). The question which now concerns us is this: Is this reconciliation only on the part of man, or is it mutual? It is true that throughout the N.T. men are exhorted to be reconciled, but that is because God in Christ is preached as reconciled inasmuch as He is 'not reckoning unto men their trespasses,' and this is surely 'the word of reconciliation' (2 Co 5¹⁹). V.²¹ in this passage states the divine fact on which the human duty in v.²⁰ depends. A reconciled God calls on men to be reconciled. For regarding the reconciliation as mutual the following reasons can be given: (i) In Ro 11²⁸ 'enemies' and beloved are contrasted in such a way that the former must be regarded as objects of God's hostility as the latter are of His affection. (ii) In Ro 5¹⁰ it is stated that 'we were reconciled to God through the death of his Son' even 'while we were enemies'—that is, before the process of

man's reconciliation to God had begun. (iii) If God's wrath may be spoken of, surely no less His reconciliation. (iv) This conclusion also follows from the description of Christ's death as *propitiatory*, which can only mean that God is set forth in that death as propitiated; that is, Christ's death as an adequate and effective manifestation of God's righteousness makes possible a change not in God's disposition or purpose towards men, but in His attitude; the pain of His judgment on men is changed to the joy of His favour to men.

3. While it may be admitted that the word *redemption* does not necessarily mean deliverance by *ransom*, so that it is not necessary for us to ask what was the ransom, or to whom was it paid, as one of the earliest of the theories of the atonement did; and that the word reconciliation, even if mutual between God and man, does not itself raise the problem of expiation or atonement; yet the term, *the righteousness of God*, as describing the gift of God to man in Christ, does indicate that forgiveness will come in such a way as not to be inconsistent with God's holiness and His consequent judgment on sin. As God's judgment in the past had been tempered with mercy, as forgiveness was now being offered without judgment on men, that necessary connexion between God's holiness and His judgment on sin might be put in doubt. That doubt must be removed so completely and finally that no possibility of misunderstanding might remain; that doubt is removed by the revelation in Christ Jesus, 'whom God set forth *propitiatory* through faith by his blood' (3²⁵). (a) The Greek word, *ἱλαστήριον*, is usually a noun, meaning 'the place or vehicle of propitiation,' but originally it is the neuter of an adjective. Although in the LXX and He 9⁵ it is used for the lid of the ark of the covenant, on which the Shekinah rested, and which was sprinkled on the Day of Atonement with the blood of the sacrifice, yet, strong as are the arguments for this meaning, on the whole it is improbable that Paul would have introduced an allusion so obscure to the majority of the readers without some fuller explanation. No evidence of the use of the word in the sense of propitiatory victim has been produced; and there is an advantage in taking the word as an adjective in the most general sense possible. The word itself is not decisive for the meaning in Paul's mind. This, at least, it must

mean, that the death of Christ is that which *reveals* God as propitious to sinners, and even, we must add, renders God propitious, as showing both God's wrath against sin and the appeasement of that wrath. Paul is not solitary in the use of the word in connexion with the work of Christ. The writer of the First Epistle of John declares that Christ 'is the propitiation (*ἱλασμός*) for our sins, and not for ours only, but also for the whole world' (2²). He returns to the fact, and states its motive: 'Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins' (4¹⁰). According to the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 'it behoved Christ in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might be a merciful and faithful high priest in things pertaining to God, to make propitiation (*εἰς τὸ ἱλάσκεσθαι*) for the sins of the people' (2¹⁷).

(b) Two circles of ideas seem here to intersect—the one legal, the other ritual. Many scholars maintain that the Old Testament conception of sacrifice excludes the idea of penal substitution or satisfaction; the victim does not bear the penalty, and so meet the demands of the law. By sacrifice communion with God is maintained, or, if interrupted by any transgression, restored. Even if this be so, it must be admitted that the sin and the trespass offering had reference to breaches of the law, and were regarded as the divinely appointed means of securing God's forgiveness. That the Psalmist disclaims the intention of seeking to recover God's favour by a sacrifice (a burnt-offering, Ps 51¹⁶) shows that others so regarded sacrifice. While he is content with offering the sacrifice of a 'broken spirit,' and is sure that God will not despise 'a broken and a contrite heart' (v.¹⁷), the prophet, in his description of the Suffering Servant, explicitly states that it pleased Yahveh 'to make his soul a guilt-offering' (Is 53¹⁰), and the dominant thought is that of penal substitution and satisfaction (v.⁵). It is highly probable that we have this same combination of ideas here. Paul may have been thinking not only of the sacrifices of the Jewish ritual, but also of some of the human sacrifices familiar from Greek and Roman story. It is true that he does not give the prominence to the idea of sacrifice which the Epistle to the Hebrews does; but he does refer to Christ's death as a sacrifice. He describes Christ as the passover lamb (1 Co 5⁷⁻⁸). In his account

of the Lord's Supper Christ is represented as the sacrifice of the new covenant (1 Co 11²⁵). It is not improbable that in Ro 8³ the phrase *περὶ ἀμαρτίας* is rightly rendered in the R.V. 'as an offering for sin.' His references to the blood of Christ (Ro 5⁹, Eph 1⁷ 2¹³, Col 1²⁰) and his connecting of forgiveness with the death of Christ (1 Co 15³, 2 Co 5²¹, Eph 1⁷, Col 1^{14, 20}) confirm the conclusion that Paul did habitually think of the death of Christ as a sacrifice, and that he would have accepted the general principle laid down by the Epistle to the Hebrews (9²²), 'without shedding of blood there is no remission.' It does not follow, however, that he had fused together the two conceptions of sacrifice and of penal substitution and satisfaction, and that he explained to himself the efficacy of sacrifice by its character as penal. We have no convincing evidence on that point. What is certain, that he did think of Christ's death under both conceptions without making any distinction. We are not warranted in weakening the force of this conclusion by the explanation that in sacrifice the sprinkling of the blood on the altar, signifying the presentation of the life to God, was the important matter, not the shedding of the blood signifying the death of the victim; for in the N.T. use of the sacrificial imagery it is the blood-shedding, and not the blood-sprinkling alone, on which the stress is often laid. The two ideas go together, for the shedding makes the blood available for the sprinkling. Christ's offering unto God was certainly His holy obedience, but He rendered that in suffering death. In Paul's teaching at least we must admit the conception of penal substitution and satisfaction. It is the Epistle to the Hebrews which gives prominence to the other thought. If vicarious suffering is not the sole element in Christ's sacrifice, but representative submission is also included, yet it is an essential element, and, without setting

aside the teaching of the N.T., it cannot be got rid of from the Christian doctrine of the Atonement.

(c) A misunderstanding of the phrase 'through faith' must be removed. Paul does not mean that faith gives to the death of Christ a meaning as propitiatory that it would not otherwise have had. It is propitiatory as objective fact, but the application and appropriation of the fact for individual salvation is by faith; and to unbelief, this value, real as it is, is not disclosed. May we not add that it is only as a man experiences the Christian salvation that he can interpret Christ's sacrifice?

(d) What is the *rationale* of the Cross for Paul? 2 Co 5²¹ is the decisive statement. On the Cross the sinless was treated as sin. The consequences of the sin of mankind were appointed to Him by God, and were accepted by Him. This is the meaning of Is 52¹³-53¹². Paul avoids saying that Christ was made a sinner, or that He was accursed (Gal 3¹³), and probably he would not have said that He was held guilty or punished for us; but that He suffered for us, even instead of us, he does undoubtedly teach. This suffering he regards as a perfect manifestation of God's judgment on sin, more adequate for God's demand and man's need than all other judgments could be. As a manifestation of judgment it is a vindication of God's righteousness, the consistency of His action with His character as perfect. Such a vindication has its historical necessity in the danger of men misunderstanding the tempering of God's judgment by His mercy, or the forgiveness of sin, apart from such a judgment. But for Paul it seems to have an eternal necessity in the character of God Himself. It was only by showing Himself propitiatory in Christ's blood that He could be righteous, while reckoning righteous those who have faith in Christ (3²⁶).

(To be concluded.)

Literature.

THE ITALIAN MYSTICS.

MR. EDWARD MASLIN HULME has translated into English *L'Italie Mystique*, written by M. Emile Gebhart, and has given it the title of *Mystics and Heretics in Italy* (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net).

Nicholas-Emile Gebhart (to give him his full name) was born in 1839 at Nancy, the old capital of Lorraine. He spent fourteen years as Assistant Professor of Foreign Literature in his native town, and then twenty-six years as Professor of Foreign Literature at the Sorbonne in Paris. He was elected to the French Academy in 1904, and died in 1908, his place in the Academy being taken by Poincaré. His chief books are a study of *Rabelais*, a work on *The Origins of the Renaissance, Mystic Italy*, and two appreciations—one of *Botticelli*, one of *Michelangelo*. He also wrote an historical novel, *Around a Tiara*, which was not successful.

'The first sight of him was disconcerting enough: a head quite round in shape, cheeks and neck fat and puffy; one would have sworn he was some Rabelaisian canon or monk. Only the small, lively and mobile eye, that was wont suddenly to light up, betrayed the mind that watched beneath this sleepy appearance, a mind that was curious, observant and amused with the things of life.'

Of the *Mystic Italy*, now translated, he says: 'I purpose in this book to describe the heroic period of that history. The first attempts at heresy or schism, Arnold of Brescia, Joachim of Flora, Francis of Assisi and his religious creation, Frederic II. and the civilization of southern Italy, the revival of Joachimism in the institutions of Assisi, the militant work of the Holy See between the times of Innocent III. (1198-1216) and Boniface VIII. (1294-1303), will occupy our attention one after another. At the same time I shall indicate what part Italian faith played in the renovation of the arts and poetry, and what beam, sent forth by the great Christians of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, rested on the cradle of Nicholas and John of Pisa, Giotto, Jacopone of Todi, and Dante.'

The book appears to be translated with affectionate care. The translator has had his difficulties: 'There is no English for Ronsard's *Mignonne*, *allons voir si la rose*; nor for his *Quand*

vous serez bien vieille, au soir, à la chandelle; and there does not seem to be an equivalent in English for many passages in Gebhart's subtle and musical prose, every line of which has been as delicately pondered as though it were poetry.' But he has overcome. The translation is easy to read and evidently conveys the author's meaning.

The most original and interesting part is the chapter on the Emperor Frederic II. M. Gebhart has not solved the mystery surrounding that mysterious personality of the Middle Ages, but he has made him live. Even the Dante chapter has originality and vitality. With Dante, says M. Gebhart, 'the supreme sin, that which he punishes with crushing contempt, is not heresy, nor unbelief, which he has shown, by the very disdain and lofty countenance of the damned, to be superior to hell; it is *viltà*, the timid renunciation of active duty, devotion, and life, the cowardice of pope Celestine, more criminal than the treason of Judas.'

THE POETIC MIND.

The most sustained and systematic discussion of what poetry is and where it comes from that has been issued in our day is to be found in a volume entitled *The Poetic Mind* (Macmillan), written by Frederick Clarke Prescott, Professor of English in Cornell University. This is how the author himself explains the purpose of his book: 'I wish to attempt some further explanation of poetic vision, of the poetic imagination and poetic creation, of the poetic madness, and of the prophetic nature and function of poetry. I intend, however, not so much to present any novel theories of my own on these subjects, as to bring together and systematize views which have long been held in regard to poetry—which have been expressed, often figuratively and obscurely, by the poets themselves, in various ages and in many books—which, therefore, have remained scattered and, to have their full value, must be brought together from a wide reading of literature—which must be interpreted and correlated, often indeed translated from the language of poetry to that of prose.'

'In proceeding thus,' he continues, 'I shall

have often to quote at length from these sources ; and I beg the reader not merely to pardon the constant quotation, but to attend particularly to the quotations as the best possible evidence and as more authoritative and usually more important than the text.'

Should that statement suggest to any one that the book is a collection of quotations, the suggestion may be dismissed. Professor Prescott has written the book himself. The quotations are not too numerous, and they are always illustrative, solely illustrative, of his writing.

Professor Prescott's fundamental idea is that poetry is beyond the control of the poet. It is outside his will, and even his consciousness, as surely as his dreams are. Indeed there is a close affinity between the poet and the dreamer. 'Poets are often, if not always, great dreamers, whether by night or by day. Goethe, Blake, Lamb, Coleridge, De Quincey, and many others recount vivid, beautiful, or horrible dream experiences, sometimes in sleep, sometimes in waking, often ambiguous between the two. This suggests that poetry and dreams are products of the same imaginative operation. Tolstoi in his *Souvenirs* writes of lying warm in bed and "losing himself in delicious dreams and recollections." He looks fixedly at the fold in the counterpane and sees before him his sweetheart, as clearly as when he left her an hour before. "In imagination," he says, "I talked with her, and this conversation, though entirely lacking in sense, at least gave me indescribable pleasure, because it was filled with affectionate *thee's* and *thou's*. These dreams were so distinct that the pleasurable emotions prevented my sleeping," etc. The "dreams" then were in waking, but they might easily have been continued in sleep, and whether true dreams or only reverie or vision, they might equally serve as material for a scene in fiction. Thus reverie often runs into dream and dream encroaches on waking life. Poe confused the experiences of sleep and waking: "The realities of the world affected me as visions, and as visions only, while the wild ideas of the land of dreams became, in turn,—not the material of my everyday existence,—but in very deed that existence solely and in itself." "To dream," he says, "has been the business of my life." Such cases, of which there are many, lead Chabaneix to suppose that the poet is one in whom the dream state obtrudes anomalously into waking

life. It would be better, however, in my opinion, to regard both dream and waking vision as the products of the same mental operation occurring naturally and indifferently in either sleep or waking.'

Is there, then, nothing in the poet himself that gives origin or even opening to the poem? Yes. There is desire. It is so with dreams. 'At any rate I have no doubt that Freud is right when properly understood; at least—the conclusion need go no farther than this for the present purpose—that the great majority of dreams are open or concealed expressions of the desires. Apart from the evidence adduced by the psychologists I should take this view from my own observation, and from evidence in language and literature. In language to realize one's widest dream is to obtain one's fondest wish. In literature dreams are oftenest of the type of Isaiah: "It shall even be as when a hungry man dreameth, and, behold, he eateth; but he awaketh, and his soul is empty: or as when a thirsty man dreameth, and, behold, he drinketh; but he awaketh and, behold, he is faint, and his soul hath appetite." The following is typical in English literature:

The wery hunter, sleping in his bed,

To wōde ayein his mynde goth anoon;

The Juge dremeth how his plees ben sped;

The carter dremeth how his cartes goon;

The rich of gold; the knight fight with his foon;

The seke met [dreams] he drinketh of the tonne;

The lover met he hath his lady wonne.'

It is so with poetry. 'Convincing as evidence are many poems of which the following sonnet by Alice Meynell is a type. If in this the reader will observe carefully how the desire, impeded from action, leads to the dream (as also to the poem itself) he will fix a relation which is illustrated again and again in literature.

I must not think of thee; and tired yet strong,

I shun the love that lurks in all delight—

The love of thee—and in the blue of Heaven's height,

And in the dearest passage of a song.

Oh, just beyond the sweetest thoughts that throng

This breast, the thought of thee waits hidden yet bright;

But it must never, never come in sight;

I must stop short of thee the whole day long.

But when sleep comes to close each difficult day,
 When night gives pause to the long watch I keep,
 And all my bonds I needs must loose apart,
 Must doff my will as raiment lay away,—
 With the first dream that comes with the first sleep,
 I run, I run, I am gathered to thy heart.'

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

A valuable book on the New Testament has been published by Messrs. Methuen. The author is the Rev. G. W. Wade, D.D., Senior Tutor of St. David's College, Lampeter. Dr. Wade's scholarship is already widely recognized on account of his articles in the Dictionaries and his book on the Old Testament. This book is meant to follow the Old Testament book. Its title is *New Testament History* (18s. net), just as the title of the other was 'Old Testament History.'

But it is a much larger and a much more important book. It is divided into three parts. The first part introduces the History by giving an account of the topography of Palestine, the Roman Empire—its provincial system and the conditions in the Empire conducive to the diffusion of Christianity, the Jewish institutions, and the prevailing ideas and methods of Jewish historians.

In the second part we reach the text of the New Testament writings, and are furnished with a full and minute description of the present state, first of textual, and then of documentary, criticism—in other words, of the Lower and the Higher Criticism.

The third part is the history proper. After a preliminary note on the chronology (which fills ten pages), we have the ministry of Jesus according to the earliest sources, followed by an additional note on His ministry according to the Fourth Gospel, then the History of the Church in the Apostolic Age, and, last of all, a long section on theological development in the New Testament, the development being traced separately through the teaching of Jesus, the teaching of the Primitive Church, the teaching of Revelation, the teaching of St. Paul, the teaching of Hebrews, and the teaching of the Johannine Writings.

The book contains, further, ten maps and plans and a carefully compiled index.

Is all this only a catalogue of contents? Only so could any idea be conveyed of what this

book is. And it is enough. We know that Dr. Wade is thoroughly furnished for such work as this. We know that his ability and his industry keep step. We know that he writes clearly. We know that it is to-day's (if not to-morrow's) attitude that we shall find adopted in his book. And all we need do now is to give an example. This is what he says on a matter much discussed at the moment :

'In forming a judgment upon the qualities of *Acts* as a history, a recognition of these exceptional merits of St. Luke must be qualified by considerations in part affecting generally writers of his time and race, and in part peculiar to him as an individual author. In the first place, he was very tolerant of inconsistencies in what he wrote, and allowed discrepancies, sometimes slight, but at other times of more importance, to exist side by side; he was not very critical of the materials at his disposal, or exacting in his estimate of evidence; and he was much attracted by stories of the marvellous. And secondly, in composing his history, he did not view his subject from a detached standpoint and in a dispassionate spirit, but he was inspired by the desire to commend a cause in which he was deeply interested, and with some of the leaders of which he had been closely associated; and he was consequently subject to the temptation of putting upon what he included in his work as favourable a colouring as possible.'

THE ROMAN CHURCH AND THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Rev. Cuthbert Lattey, S.J., has edited a volume of essays by Fathers of the Society of Jesus on *Moses and the Law* (Griffiths; 3s. 6d. net). The contributors are unknown to us, but they may be well known within their own Communion. In any case they seem to be competent. But they are hampered. They are hampered by the Biblical Commission of 1909. And they feel it. The very first of them makes this confession: 'It need hardly be said that we have no desire to put forward anything that is not in entire accord with the decisions there arrived at.' But for the Commission it is clear that we should have had something on 'the Days of Genesis' more in accordance with scholarship. Mr. Lattey himself throws the results of modern criticism of the Old Testament

to the owls—and can go forward with more equanimity.

But the writer of the article on the Flood finds himself in serious difficulties. 'Scripture does not, then, require the whole world to have been covered by the Flood. We can interpret Genesis easily to mean a partial Flood. It must be admitted that the Fathers suppose the former, but their consensus here is not Tradition in the strict sense. On this point we cannot do better than quote from the admirable commentary on Genesis published in 1910 by the learned Capuchin, Father Hetzenauer, Professor of Exegesis at the Papal Seminary of St. Apollinaris, Rome (pp. 169, 170). We translate from the Latin:

'It is true that the Fathers, theologians, and exegetes of the Church, up to the seventeenth century, commonly taught the geographical universality of the Flood; but their doctrine on this point is not Tradition in the strict sense. We must carefully distinguish. If the Fathers teach anything with a unanimous consensus, and, moreover, *as belonging to faith or morals* (Leo XIII.), or if, directly or indirectly, they put forward the explanations which they give *as the sense of the Church*, then their unanimous consensus shows the true Tradition of the Church and the true sense of the Bible, and is binding upon all Catholic exegetes. But if they explain some passage of the Bible with, it is true, a unanimous consensus, but neither directly nor indirectly put forward this explanation as the sense of the Church, then we have the common opinion of the teachers of those times, but not Tradition in the strict sense. And we can desert such a private opinion of the Fathers, theologians, and exegetes, as Leo XIII. and Pius X. show us. Now, the Fathers, neither directly nor indirectly, put forward the geographical universality of the Flood as the sense of the Church, or as a doctrine of faith or morals; therefore Tradition in the strict sense does not teach this universality.'

PALESTINE.

A book for children is a book for parents. So nearly always. So certainly when the writer is Miss Gertrude Hollis. For the gift of charm is hers. And charm in writing is more than charm in manner, since so many more are pleased by it.

Miss Hollis has written a book on Palestine.

She calls it (for titles are now scarce) *The Land of the Incarnation* (Wells Gardner; 5s.). It contains a history of the land and an account of its people. The history is carried down to the Great War. The people too are described to date. Thus in Jerusalem to-day:

'Perhaps we may meet a man with thick long hair like a woman, dressed in a straight black garment, and wearing a tall, straight black hat with a brim at the top. He is a priest of the Greek Church, and also, if his hat has the brim, a monk from one of the monasteries. Another man in a rough brown cassock, with a cream-coloured cord round his waist, and sandals on his feet, is one of the Franciscan friars, who take care of the Holy Places, perhaps an Italian or Spaniard.

'There are, perhaps, three women wearing their veils quite differently, and another who does not wear a veil at all. This one, whose face is quite covered, is a Syrian Mohammedan; the one with both eyes visible, and a curious uncomfortable-looking metal tube down the nose, is an Egyptian; and the one who has only one of her eyes in sight must be a Druse with a secret religion. The unveiled woman must be a Jew or a Christian.

'The boy in the striped blanket kind of cloak, with the thick ruff round his neck, bare arms and legs, and perhaps a whistle made of a reed in his hand, is a shepherd who looks just as David looked when Samuel called him to be king of Israel; and the man in the same shaped cloak, covered with fish-scales, is getting his living on the Sea of Galilee just as the Apostles did in the time of our Lord.'

Professor John Dewey has written an Introduction to Social Psychology under the title of *Human Nature and Conduct* (Allen & Unwin; 10s. 6d. net). Professor Dewey is the head of the Pragmatists, and he never writes without commending Pragmatism. Here we have it most manifestly at the end. 'Morals is connected with actualities of existence, not with ideals, ends and obligations independent of concrete actualities. The facts upon which it depends are those which arise out of active connections of human beings with one another, the consequences of their mutually intertwined activities in the life of desire, belief, judgment, satisfaction and dissatisfaction.'

Now pragmatism certainly gives him the opportunity of deciding between the claims of individual and social ethics. For there are two schools at present of social reform. 'One bases itself upon the notion of a morality which springs from an inner freedom, something mysteriously cooped up within personality. It asserts that the only way to change institutions is for men to purify their own hearts, and that when this has been accomplished, change of institutions will follow of itself. The other school denies the existence of any such inner power, and in so doing conceives that it has denied all moral freedom. It says that men are made what they are by the forces of the environment, that human nature is purely malleable, and that till institutions are changed, nothing can be done. Clearly this leaves the outcome as hopeless as does an appeal to an inner rectitude and benevolence. For it provides no leverage for change of environment. It throws us back upon accident, usually disguised as a necessary law of history or evolution, and trusts to some violent change, symbolized by civil war, to usher in an abrupt millennium. There is an alternative to being penned in between these two theories. We can recognize that all conduct is *interaction* between elements of human nature and the environment, natural and social. Then we shall see that progress proceeds in two ways, and that freedom is found in that kind of interaction which maintains an environment in which human desire and choice count for something. There are in truth forces in man as well as without him. While they are infinitely frail in comparison with exterior forces, yet they may have the support of a foreseeing and contriving intelligence. When we look at the problem as one of an adjustment to be intelligently attained, the issue shifts from within personality to an engineering issue, the establishment of arts of education and social guidance.'

Those two quotations give us the 'hang' of the book. But there are many other good things in it well expressed. In particular there is a comparison between Epicureanism and Utilitarianism, very telling and very true.

How are you to occupy your Girl Guides of an evening? *Friends of all the World* (C.M.S.; 1s. net) will instruct you. The author is Mar-La T. Foster.

Professor George Jackson, B.A., D.D., has been in the habit of contributing an article every fortnight to the *Manchester Guardian*. He has now published a selection from these articles. The title of the book is *Reasonable Religion* (James Clarke & Co.; 6s. net).

Reasonable religion is not the opposite of mystical religion. It is religion that can be offered to the average man, the average reader of the *Manchester Guardian*. And it is religion. Dr. Jackson is as sound on 'the fundamentals' as a Scottish theologian—for whom, by the way, he has much respect; one part of the volume is given to his praise. Thought and language—all is modern. We see now, if never clearly before, that a man may be a Modernist and yet believe heartily in the deity of Christ and in the resurrection from the dead on the third day.

Professor Jackson must allow us to break a lance with him over A. B. Davidson. After quoting something from Denney, he says: 'It is doubtful if Davidson could have ever said that; it is doubtful, indeed, if he would have thought the better of himself for being able to say it. It was as natural for him to be cautious as it was for Denney to be frank. All through the great controversy in which Robertson Smith was the central figure he did no more to save his brilliant pupil from the wolves than cast for him a silent vote. Perhaps, as Dr. Strahan suggests, he was repelled by Smith's pugnacity and what he thought his lack of the pastoral instinct. And of course candour like Denney's has its perils, but it has also its exceeding great rewards.'

Now that (let us say it emphatically) is all wrong. Davidson was *incapable* of being moved from the right way by such considerations. He certainly did not think of Robertson Smith's pugnacity or pastoral instinct, and he certainly did not think of himself. He considered only how the truth could best be served. And he served it. He served it better than Robertson Smith or Denney. It is to him that the Old Testament owes the great interest that it has had for our generation; it is to him that we owe our understanding of it.

The book is very readable, and the reading is very profitable. Direct the attention of other editors to this feature of the *Manchester Guardian*. And congratulate the people of Manchester.

We have already had a quotation from *More Trivia* (Constable; 6s. net). It is, you remember, Mr. Logan Pearsall Smith's new book, successor to 'Trivia' the successful. But what is it? It is a treatise on the art of pleasing. It is an encouragement to go through life smiling.

Dr. Lynn Harold Hough has brought together a volume of papers. The first and best is his inaugural address as Professor of Historical Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute. Its subject is 'The Approach to Life through History,' and it gives the book its title *Life and History* (Doran). In the second paper there is a good description of the art of interpretation; and a distinction is drawn between interpretation and research. Thereafter the preacher dominates the book, although between 'Making Theology Live' and 'The Genius of John Kelman' comes 'Dante and his Century.' It is all very pleasant.

Dr. Charles E. Erdman, Professor of Practical Theology in the Princeton Theological Seminary, has made a fine attempt to reconcile the pre- and the post-millenarians, by assuring them that the date and manner of the Second Coming are of little consequence: the important thing is the fact of the Return. The title is *The Return of Christ* (Doran; \$1 net). The book is introduced by Dr. J. Stuart Holden, who says that the author's standpoint and consequent views are identical with his own.

It is a lucid, reasonable, evangelical book. One word only: Is not the presence and work of the Holy Spirit in the Church somewhat left out of account? Dr. Stuart Holden says: 'No permanent peace, no brotherhood of man, ever can be established by force of arms or skill of diplomacy. The coming of Christ himself is the only hope for his people.' Is there not a third alternative?

The purpose of Professor Max L. Margolis in *The Hebrew Scriptures in the Making* (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society) seems to be to commend to his Jewish readers the critical study of the Old Testament. In any case that is what he does. And he does it with much tact as well as learning.

Dr. Wallace E. Caldwell, Instructor in History

in Columbia University, has written a history of peace and war in Greece. The title is *Hellenic Conceptions of Peace* (P. S. King & Son; 5s.). It is a history of ideas, but the ideas are illustrated by the facts. We have the familiar story of the Peloponnesian War, for example, retold, with a new thought in our mind—how it taught the Athenians the evils of war, the blessings of peace. And we have the ideas of the great writers, ideas which they themselves formed, on the events that were happening. Sophocles 'pointed out the evil effects for the state, since war took the best of the young men and left the weaklings. "The well-born and the good Ares loves to snatch, while he who is bold in tongue, fleeing from danger, is free from harm, for Ares careth not for the coward."' Herodotus in one short sentence 'delivered a terrible condemnation of war. "Since in war fathers bury their sons, while in peace sons bury their fathers, no one is so senseless as to choose war in place of peace."' Aristophanes wrote a whole Play about Peace. Think, he said:

Think of all the thousand pleasures,

Comrades, which to Peace we owe,
All the life of ease and comfort

Which she gave us long ago:

Figs and olives, vines and myrtles,

Luscious fruits, preserved and dried,

Banks of fragrant violets, blowing

By the crystal fountain-side;

Scenes for which our hearts are yearning,

Joys that we have missed so long—

Comrades, here is Peace returning,

Greet her back with dance and song.

A clear, simple, orderly introduction to the study of Economics has been written by L. Southern, M.A., B.Sc., Wh.Sch. It has been published by the Labour Publishing Company (Tavistock Square) under the title of *Physical Economics* (2s. 6d.). It is not a book for the schoolroom. It does not contain facts to be crammed, but principles to be pondered. And it takes some pondering. All the same it is an introduction to Economics, more true, more practical in the end, than all the school-books taken together.

A Bibliography of Religion (mainly Avestan and Vedic) has been prepared by Jamshedji E.

Saklatwalla (Luzac; 4s. net). There are not a few misprints in it. A bad example is:

'Hastings, J. Editor the Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, 13 vols., Edinburgh 1908-1907. (refer variousarheles on Oriental Religions).'

There are, of course, many omissions, and there are some useless inclusions, such as:

'Guthrie, Thomas. Studies of Character from the Old Testament. (I and II Series.)'

But withal the book deserves the attention of scholars, and the author deserves the hearty thanks of students. Another edition (which is likely to be called for) will correct the errors and supply the most necessary of the omissions. The form in which it is published is attractive.

In *The Fisher-Folk of Buchan*, by Mr. John McGibbon (Marshall Brothers; 4s. 6d. net), we have 'things as they really are in a Scotch fishing town.' The town is Peterhead. Surely the book will be well read there, for there is no disguise, probably not even the change of a name. But it is as kindly as it is true, and no offence will be taken. Here is a scene oft witnessed and worth witnessing often. 'In Jeems Turner's old hall, that is now occupied by the Salvation Army, another meeting of the same free and easy character is in progress. The crowd of men and women who pack themselves into that building is tremendous, and often they will overflow from the hall on to the stairs, glad if they can get a peep inside and hear what is going on. This is also an open meeting for anyone who cares to speak or sing, or pray. The swinging sea-hymns that the fisher-folk are so fond of singing, with the rollicking chorus that every one can join in with, are being sung with all their heart and soul. Such grand old hymns as "Rescue the perishing, care for the dying," or one that has a chorus like "Pull for the shore, sailor, pull for the shore," are caught up and sung over and over again. As the testimonies and singing are open to all, old and young throw themselves into these exercises with so much enthusiasm that there is scarcely time for all to speak who would like to. Orthodox people might say that to their taste it lacked solemnity, but our fisher-folk know when to be free, and when to be solemn, and their reply to any such

criticism would be, "Man, it's graund; where the speerit o' the Lord is there is leeberty."

Mr. David Baron, who is of Jewish race, has written a book on *The Servant of Jehovah* (Morgan & Scott; 5s. net). It is a valuable book. With all the commentaries in existence there is room for it. Mr. Baron holds firmly by the prophetic reference to a single vicarious sufferer and the complete fulfilment in Jesus the Christ. He quotes effectively from the early Jewish commentators, none of whom ever thought of the nation as the Suffering Servant till Rashi came and made that welcome suggestion.

Why God became Man (Sands; 3s. 6d. net) is the title (with apologies to Anselm) which the Rev. Leslie J. Walker, S.J., M.A., has chosen for a book which is more than an argument for the Incarnation. It is an answer to Job's cry, 'Oh, that I knew where I might find him.' Mr. Walker's answer finally is, 'in the Church.' But he reaches that final answer after an interesting account of the cry itself, its origin, its universality, and then of the answer to it in the Synoptic Gospels, in John, and by the ministration of the Spirit. As the Spirit is given to the Church, it is there and there only that the human cry finds its satisfaction.

To the S.P.C.K. 'Texts for Students' add now *An English Translation of the So-called Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians* (6d.).

The *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi* has been edited, with Introduction and Apparatus Criticus, by J. M. Harden, B.D., LL.D., Trinity College, Dublin (S.P.C.K.; 10s. net).

In the Introduction Dr. Harden tells the story of this Psalter, fully and lucidly. A text of the Hebrew Psalter, with the title *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*, was edited by P. A. de Lagarde in 1874, but it is now very scarce. Four editions besides Lagarde's appeared in the nineteenth century, one of them edited by Nestle of Tübingen. Dr. Harden has a poor opinion of this edition; he calls it a piece of patchwork. But all Nestle's work was of the finest scholarship. His Psalter was, like his Greek New Testament, a 'resultant' edition.

Dr. Harden has formed his own text after

consulting previous editions and collecting available manuscripts. He gives a list of the manuscripts collated. He says: 'The present is the first edition of the Hebrew Psalter to the text of which the evidence of any of the British manuscripts has contributed. Doubtless in it there will be found mistakes, due not only to errors of judgment, but also to those inaccuracies which seem almost inevitable when so many variants have to be dealt with and chronicled. The evidence, however, on which the text is based is before the reader in the notes. This at least will, it is hoped, be some contribution to the study of the *Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos Hieronymi*.'

Mr. Philip Whitwell Wilson has been in the United States of America studying the working of the laws against alcohol. Now 'P. W. W.' is the incarnation of honesty. What he sees he says he sees: what he says may be safely said after him. He has gathered the results of his observations into a book, which may be accepted as entirely reliable. Its title is *After Two Years* (United Kingdom Alliance; 6d.).

In New York he witnessed a 'wet' parade day. The parade 'was attended by about 15,000 persons in a city of six millions, which includes one-third Jews, an immense Irish, German, and Italian population, and, of course, Tammany Hall. The banners were stirring:

"Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake."

"God turned water into wine at Cana. The hypocrites turned wine into water in Congress. Where do we get off?"

"How does it feel to be a criminal? Ask Dad—he knows."

'The Italians carried a picture of the Last Supper by Leonarda da Vinci, and Cromwell as a brewer was invoked. But the occasion was a funeral. It meant that "John Barleycorn," as they call him, was dead.'

He was much struck with the complete absence of drink on the railways. 'It is really no use for bishops, deans, and vicars of the Episcopal Church in England to talk about liquor as if it were a virtue. In all my travel I have never seen a woman insulted and never seen a man the worse for drink.'

A Communion Meditation.

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR J. GOSSIP, M.A., ABERDEEN.

'This is the day of the Lord's own contriving. Let us be glad and rejoice in it. O Lord, save us, we pray. O Lord, prosper us, we pray.'—Ps 118^{24, 25}.

THIS is a day of the Lord's own contriving, which an infinitude of Divine love and thoughtfulness and grace has alone made possible. And therefore, in the first place, now that this bend in the road has brought us within sight of Calvary, let us stand still awhile and look, until we grasp and feel again the wonder and amazement of the facts that meet us here.

Mrs. Meynell has a little poem, which Ruskin, in a reckless burst of too exuberant enthusiasm, once termed the finest thing in modern poetry, in which she stands and, dallying with an ordinary daisy in her hand, peers, as through a window, far out into mysteries inscrutable to us; muses and dreams of all that lies behind that common weed, all that went to the making of it, all that had to be

in order that it might exist—stands, all at once dwarfed, abashed, humbled, in a world suddenly grown awesome.

O daisy mine, what will it be to look
From God's side even of such a simple thing!

Was that the mood of this old singer of the long ago? Perhaps he had come up to the Temple as so often before, by the well-known road that he had traversed scores of times, nodding to the usual faces on the way; and, standing in the accustomed place, had seen and heard the daily service move on through its customary stately ritual, perhaps dully enough, with a mind atrophied by long familiarity; perhaps really accepting the gifts offered—God's strange affection for us, God's eager forgiveness, God's stubborn faith in those who have failed Him so often and so signally, God's queer belief that even yet things can be

righted and the twisted life made straight—accepting, but with little wonderment.

It was all so usual; it had all so often been experienced before, was taken as a thing of course. And suddenly the clouds were blown aside; and, with a heart stilled and awed and almost frightened, he saw things somewhat from God's side of them, all that had gone to the making of these gifts which he had been accepting so unthinkingly, stood there holding them in his hand, dazed and confused, thinking them out. This is a day which God alone could have contrived; and only Divine grace and loving-kindness and self-sacrifice have made it possible for me.

And is not that the mood that befits us here? At Christ's Table we do feel it somewhat, do we not?—do have a hushed sense that we are face to face with the Central things; our spirits steal on tiptoe; our noisy natures sink their loud rude voices, because God is quite close.

Yet, even here, it is so easy to turn in without much emotion or surprise; to accept even Jesus Christ as only what is due to us; to thrust out a careless hand and take God's best without excitement as no very great affair. 'Of course,' said Heine, 'God will forgive me; that's what He is for.' And yet think it out, see it from God's side, and how staggering it is! Think out anything, indeed, and long before we reach an end our minds sink tired and fluttering helpless pinions into huge yawning depths and chasms past our fathoming. Almost the one authentic poet of our day stands looking at a common dog-rose coming into bloom, and sees with amazement that the roots of that ordinary wayside bush run back almost to the beginnings of dim Time.

Very old are the woods;
And the buds that break
Out of the briar's boughs,
When March winds wake,
So old with their beauty are—
Oh, no man knows
Through what wild centuries
Roves back the rose.

All that had to be before that innocent blossom, plucked by some child, who quickly tired of it and threw it away with a careless hand, could lie there withering in the hot dust.

Or we are whirled through the country, watch the smoke wreaths curling up lazily from sleepy homesteads in the sheltered hollows. And there

are bairns upon their way to school, and women flitting to and fro about the doors, and men at work among the fields; and it is all so peaceful, so idyllic, drowsing there in the hot sun. And yet to make that cosy nook what unthinkable cataclysms and upheavals had to be; when the sea broke in, overwhelming all things, and for long æons rolled and tossed and surged above them here; when the mountains were heaved up with confusion and tumult, when the gliding glaciers slowly, age after age, ground down the ragged peaks to this soft billowy upland, when the kindly soil was fashioned by wild hurricane and bitter frost and howling tempest out of the hard rocks—all that was necessary that these quiet fields might lie so soft and green and golden in the low morning sunlight.

And here are we, a company of needy folk gathering in hopefully about Christ's Table, sure that we shall be uplifted, granted every grace and power we can require. And yet, could we take these simple symbols into our hands, and realize all that went to the making of them; could we see from God's side of them, how staggering, how stupendous it would be.

The whole New Testament is just an effort to do that—to show us these things from God's side. They know that they are failing; they are conscious that it breaks through language, won't describe, eludes them, that, as Luther says, they are using half words and quarter words like a baby; they stammer, they stutter, they feel great tides and currents seize them and sweep them off their feet and far out into vast deeps, where they can but throw up their hands and sink. And yet they do bring home to us something of the wonder of it all; do make us see it somewhat from God's side. Look! they cry, look! and, following their pointing finger, can't you see that stolid knot of soldiery haughtily pushing back that jeering, hooting crowd; and that tired Figure in the midst, how worn, how broken in body from the horrors of the iron-tipped Roman lash? See, they have laid the Cross upon the ground, have thrown Him down upon it. Ah! the nails run like fire through the sensitive flesh! See! they have lifted Cross and Victim and dunted it roughly into the socket. 'It is excruciating,' men cry in an agony, their faces all contorted, their hands clenched, maddened by what is really unbearable. 'It is excruciating!' And excruciating means the pains of crucifixion. And the slow sun sets, and the long day wanes, and the small group

of weeping women slip back to the city, and by and by the enemies, turning for one last bitter and exultant gibe, move off, chuckling at the poor imposture that they have stamped out; and, last of all, the troops tramp back to barracks, and the stars steal out, and look down coldly upon the dishonoured dead, hanging there on a convict's gibbet. And all that had to be before your heart could hear Christ say to you to-day, 'This is My body, everything I have, and it's all for you.'

Look! they cry, and, following their finger, can't you see, past the Cross, far out into the eternities—see God as He really is? How different from what we had conceived Him! With His face grey with an agony that He has borne from all eternity. So have we hurt Him by these sins of ours which worry us scarcely at all; so intolerable to Him is this outrage of evil we have introduced into His Universe. And yet, although we have so wounded Him, He loves us, clings to us, cannot give us up. Always He has been planning how to help us; always He has been thinking how to save us from ourselves; counting no cost, reckoning up no sacrifice, heedless what it means to Him if only we be plucked back from self-destruction. And all that lies behind that crumb of ordinary bread; all that is in it, could we see it from God's side of things. Take it, man, take it freely; it is meant expressly for you. But do not your hands tremble? For, to make that possible, Christ had to die, and God's heart had to break.

I saw this people as a field of flowers,
 Each grown at such a price,
 The sum of unimaginable powers
 Did no more than suffice.
 A thousand central daisies, they,
 A thousand of the one;
 For each the entire monopoly of day
 For each the whole of the devoted sun.

Free though it be to you, the cost of that was all God's all. The wonder and amazement of the facts, seen from God's side of them!

And, then, our attitude in view of them. As to that there can be no dubiety whatever. This is a day of God's own contriving, which only Divine grace made possible. We must be glad and rejoice in it. What else is even thinkable if we really believe this, accept this, credit that Christ means what He says.

Austerely beautiful although it be, the characteristic note of our Scottish Communion rings flat

in my ears, and out of harmony with the true spirit of the day. This is no time for grave and sombre melodies, but for happy faces and for happy hearts dazed and bewildered by the immensity of their own good fortune. 'Dear me, Dr. Duncan,' they said, for the old Hebrew Professor was striding along Princes Street in Edinburgh, his face aglow and shining, smiling to himself, cracking his fingers as he walked, 'you surely have great news to-day.' 'News!' he made answer. 'News! Wonderful news—the best of news! The blood of Jesus Christ still cleanseth from all sin.' So would we feel if we really believed this; if we were not doubting, not fearing, not spinning limiting conditions whereby we may be excluded, not wondering can it be really true, nor anything except accepting it. Our Lord tells us that the most speaking picture of a genuine Christian is a child, and the characteristic of a normal child is happiness. It can't keep still, must sing and dance for the sheer joy of life. And in the Testament there is a sound of singing almost everywhere. They are the gladdest and the gayest people in the world. And little wonder! Imagine what it must have been to be immured in an appalling German prison camp. Not a doubt some of them were admirably run, but there were instances that pass description. Think what it must have meant to be penned into one of these; to have never a kindly word or human touch, to be beaten and bullied, to be starved and miserable, to have to drag oneself, though desperately ill, to one's excessive toil, to have the very women spit at you: to see the populace, as happened in one dreadful case, when virulent disease broke out, standing at a safe distance screaming with laughter, as, tottering unsteadily, one dragged one's dead companions to the burial-place, and made shift with shaking limbs to scoop a shallow grave for them: to be in the power of hatred, and unable to escape from it; and this for weeks and months and years. And then to land in England, suddenly to find that nightmare gone, with kindly faces everywhere, and compassionate eyes, and ready, helping hands, eagerly leaping out to one's assistance; to be in an atmosphere of love and pride in one, and endless sympathy. That is the difference the faith made. People had thought that the Divine powers were hostile to us, must be hostile, because we have callously broken their laws. They tried desperately to forget; but,

when they remembered, they crouched and cringed and shivered, expecting that any moment Divine wrath might leap out and blast them. And at the Cross they saw that God's heart is entirely with us; that He has not one thought towards us that is not kindly and generous and unselfish. And with that the sun broke out, and winter vanished from the earth, and of a sudden spring with its glory and its song and its rejoicing was in these folk's hearts. And we must take that in, and credit it as true for us—that God has never a thought toward us that is not merciful and gracious and very pitiful. Chalmers was no great success as a visitor among his congregation. Gladstone tells us how he once went a round with him, and how the great soul entered each new house, sat smiling, but without a word, for he had no small change of conversation, rose up, and went his way, with almost nothing said. Yet on occasion he could be effective enough. There was a melancholious soul who could not be got to believe that God could really love her, had in very deed forgiven her. And one day he burst in on her. 'Madam,' he said, 'I've come to tell you God has no ill-will at you,' and was gone. God has no ill-will at us! He might well have! Remember how we have neglected Him, forgotten Him, wounded Him, been impudent and insolent day after day. I tell you if you had treated me as I have treated God I would hate you, loathe the thought of you, be filled with an ungovernable rage the moment you came into sight. 'If I were God,' cried Luther hotly, 'I would kick this wretched world to pieces.' But God is incapable of harbouring grudges, of ill-humour and temper and peevishness; forgets, blots it all out; begins again as hopefully and patiently as ever; loves on. Even Paul can't understand that in the very least, is taken aback and staggered. It seems so unreasonable, so impossible! Why should He, and how can He? If we had been kind of half decent—but to us—to us! Yet though he doesn't understand it, he believes it, accepts it, walks in the warm sunshine of it. And so must we. This is a day that only God could have contrived for us; let us be glad and rejoice in it. Dante tells us that in his grim journeyings he came upon some in an evil plight, and asked them why this had befallen them. Once, they explained, we were sad and gloomy and sour-humoured in God's beautiful earth. And while life holds much of tragedy for some of us,

and there are many things that hurt and stab these hearts of ours till some of us must bite our lips to keep from crying out in pain, still at Christ's Table to be grave of face and unexcited can only mean that we have not grasped and taken in all that this means, the wonder and amazement of it—from God's side of it, and from ours. When the West Indian slaves were liberated, they gathered on the momentous night into their churches and knelt there in prayer. But when the long-expected hour had at last actually struck, they leapt up to their feet, singing, rejoicing, and embracing one another, laughing in sheer happiness although the tears were running down their cheeks. Free! Free! Free! In such mood surely should we gather at Christ's Table, so awed, yet so exultant and so very happy. For we too, thank God, are free! This is a great day of God's own contriving for us; let us rejoice and be glad in it.

The amazement of the facts, our attitude in view of them, and, lastly, a practical use of them. For all this, that cost so much, must not be allowed to evaporate in a mere gush of feeling and emotion, like a Highland burn roaring in spate, and yet to-morrow shrunk again to the usual thin trickle whimpering, half-choked, among the bare, bleached stones. It must be condensed to action, into real and purposeful amendment of our characters and lives. Scholars tell us that this Psalm was probably a shout of thanksgiving for some great victory, for the happy conclusion of a war in which things had for long looked ominous and hopeless. They were flocking up into the Temple to give thanks to God, like ourselves upon Armistice Day, when, for a few hours, we were really a religious people, with a vivid almost overpowering sense of God; when in many places, even in the heart of mighty cities, one had only, without announcement, to open a church and ring a bell, and in a few minutes it was packed from floor to ceiling with folk eager to bring their offering of thanksgiving. So perhaps it was here. And yet you notice this man's prayer: 'O Lord, save us, we pray; O Lord, prosper us, we pray.' But were they not there just precisely because God had saved them, and had prospered them in ways unbelievable, and yet gloriously true! Did this man feel that face to face with this colossal proof and instance of the lengths to which God's grace can go, it were sheer folly not to seize on it for all their other needs—for all the national

sores, and all his personal weaknesses? O Lord, who can save so amazingly—save us from this, and this, and this, that still besets and threatens us: O Lord, who can bring success where it looked impossible—prosper us here, and here, and here, where we have failed, and lost heart, and ceased even to try. There is a moving scripture in which God, passing before Moses, proclaims Himself as the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth, keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin. And we read how Moses hearing this made haste and, seizing on that proclamation, applied it instantly to his own wants and needs. If Thou art merciful and gracious, since Thou forgivest iniquity and sin, pardon our iniquity, forgive our sin.

So Paul, too, standing at the Cross, feels in his heart that this finally settles it, that if God has gone this length for us there is nothing that He will not grant us. If He has given us His Son, will He not freely give us anything and everything that we can need? Well, here are we, face to face with this bewildering proof of what God means when He says that He loves us, of the lengths to which He goes, of the bewilderments He does, let us make haste, and before we pass into the world and it all fades away, grows dim and far off, and an unreal, shadowy rumour blown vaguely to and fro about the world, let us apply it to our own case—this overwhelming grace, this so illimitable love, this immeasurable power to help—to our temper, our ill-humours, our touchiness, our engrained selfishness, to our besetting sins, to the temptations that have so often broken us that, daunted, we make small show of resistance now, slink tamely to heel, obedient to their first truculent whistle. Save us, O Thou whose name is Saviour, and who hast wonderfully and most surely earned Thy title,

save us from this, and this, and this; and prosper us in our endeavours to be done with our too fatally familiar self; to grow into Christ's mind and heart and characteristic ways, till, naturally and instinctively, we think His thoughts, and will His will, and live after His fashion. When the Lord Christ passed through a village everybody felt that here was a God-given and enormous opportunity that might not come again, and laid hold on it with both hands; clutched at Christ's power, applied it to their individual weaknesses, translated it into the terms of their own personal wants. The blind cried give me sight; the deaf pled make me hear; the impotent besought Him for strength to be done with helpless, weary lying—to stand up, to live a full, whole, interesting life, the life of a real man. And this is a day that God Himself has contrived for us, and we must make haste to appropriate it, use it, think it out, apply it to our individual and personal case. No doubt we are here to give Him thanks for an amazing act of condescension, for a fulness of grace that staggers us, and takes away the breath, and leaves one dazed and stunned, if we see it at all from God's side. But then, when a wise Psalmist felt like that, and came up to the Temple of set purpose to make some return to God for His bewildering goodness, thinking things out, he came to the conclusion that the truest gratitude is to be willing to accept still more. 'What shall I give to God for all His benefits?—I shall take,' he said. And Pope—found, of all men, among the prophets—tells us bluntly he was right. 'For God is paid, when man receives'; the way to thank Him is to take yet more, and more, and more.

The wonder and amazement of the facts! our attitude in view of them; a practical use of them! And so, let us sit down with the Master at His Table.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Theology and Religion.

THE firm of Hinrichs in Leipzig is issuing this year a new series of a monthly journal, known for more than thirty years as the *Kartell-Zeitung*. Its new title is *Theologische Blätter*, and its editor is

Dr. Karl Ludwig Schmidt, New Testament Professor in Giessen. A specimen copy, received from the publishers, makes a favourable impression, alike for the varied interest of its contents and the quality of its articles. Amongst the subjects treated at length are 'The History of the Synoptic Tra-

dition,' and 'Prolegomena to the Psychology of Religion.' There is also a résumé of recent works on 'New Testament Criticism,' in which satisfaction is expressed that in England and America, as well as in Germany, attempts are being made to bring to the knowledge of scholars, independently of their nationality, the work that was done during the war in the various departments of biblical and theological study.

The editor writes on 'Theology and Religion,' and distinguishes them as particular examples of the two categories 'Science' and 'Life.' Theology is not religion, but it is the science of religion. Therefore the distinction must not be represented as opposition. 'In the sermons, personal confessions, and above all in the prayers of great theologians, there is often revealed a quite naïve religious experience, although in the writings by which they are known to us the speculative element predominates.' Nevertheless, the history of religion introduces us to creative personalities who have been critics of theology, as, *e.g.* mystics, prophets, missionaries, and reformers. The religion of such men is their life, but they do not feel that it is necessary to harmonize their religious experience with the teachings of science.

To-day there are those who profess to renounce theology from religious motives, and history does indeed show that great religious revolutions have set aside the theology of the schools and have directed attention to new problems. In this way new material has been supplied to the systematic theologian; it then becomes his duty, so far as is possible, to assimilate it, remembering that he is called, as a faithful steward, to trade with the particular talent entrusted to him. Moreover, not all who pose as non-theologians are really without a theology. Group theology often differs from University theology rather in degree than in kind.

Theology should never be represented as *the* way to religion, but those who despise it should remember that it is *a* way to religion, and can render valuable help to the religious inquirer. Yet the systematic theologian is always a man of his own time; he must study the religious experience of his contemporaries, as the scientist must investigate life in its present-day manifestations; thus he will make his own contribution to the solution of the religious problems of his age. To do this effectively he must himself be a religious man. It

may be said, however, that a scholar to whom religion is an illusion may undertake and successfully carry out investigations yielding results which are of great service to theology. 'But just as one who lacks the artistic temperament can never understand a great artist, though he may have written historic treatises on art, so it is impossible for an irreligious man to fathom the depths of religion.' Rightly to investigate the Christian religion a theologian must be a true Christian. In conclusion, Dr. Schmidt insists that exegesis should be at once edifying and scientific, and that piety is an essential element in the equipment of the Christian theologian, whether he is dealing with history or with dogma.

The attention of students of the Synoptic Gospels may be called to a recent publication of the J. C. Hinrich'sche Buchhandlung, entitled *Pneuma Hagion: Der Ursprung des Geistbegriffs der synoptischen Evangelien aus der griechischen Mystik*, von Hans Leisegang (Leipzig; 9s.). It is No. 4 of the publications of the Institute for research into the comparative history of religion in the University of Leipzig. Herr Leisegang published in 1919 (Berlin: Teubner) Part I. of a comprehensive work on *The Holy Spirit*. The difficulties of publication at the present time have prevented the issue of Part II. in its entirety. The main results of his investigations have, therefore, been condensed into the present volume. In the preface Herr Leisegang states that it is far from his intention to relegate to the background the Jewish and other Oriental influences that have affected the Synoptic tradition by a one-sided emphasis on the Greek contribution to it. The question he endeavours to answer is not: What words, ideas, and representations in the Gospels can ultimately be traced either to a Greek or to a Semitic origin? The questions he asks are rather these: What would a Greek understand by those words, ideas, and representations? What did he actually take them to mean? What did he make of the Synoptic tradition? What did he read into it? Herr Leisegang says that his constant aim has been to penetrate through the dead letter to the spirit which animated the tradition. The conception of the Spirit as it finds expression in the Synoptic Gospels is examined in great detail under six headings. Material is furnished which deserves the consideration of experts who, whether they

LINDSEY PRESS.

ESSEX HALL LECTURE, 1922.

Crown 8vo. Cloth, **1s. 6d.** net. Stiff Covers, **1s.** net.

Orthodoxy.

By the Right Hon. H. A. L. FISHER.

'Touches on several large themes, especially on the influence of modern science upon religious creeds and on the doctrine of progress.'—*Spectator*.

Crown 8vo. Cloth, **2s.** net. Stiff Covers, **1s. 6d.** net.

The Author of

'Nearer, my God, to Thee.'

(SARAH FLOWER ADAMS.)

A Memoir. By H. W. STEPHENSON, M.A.

Hymns are said to have more influence than creeds in determining a people's faith, as there is certainly a more widespread response to their appeal. The hymn, 'Nearer, my God, to Thee,' is the expression of a faith that had endured many doubts and, at one time, seemed as though it would pass utterly away. This memoir brings together all that is known of the life-story of Mrs. Adams. Ministers and teachers in Sunday Schools will do well to add it to the books already on their shelves; they will find it not only readable but useful as well.

The illustrations include a reproduction in facsimile of the original MSS. of the hymn.

Crown 8vo. Cloth, **3s.** net. Stiff Covers, **2s.** net.

Aspects of Modern Unitarianism.

Edited by ALFRED HALL, M.A., B.D.

Contributors: R. NICOL CROSS, M.A., J. CYRIL FLOWER, M.A., S. H. MELLONE, M.A., D.Sc., W. WHITAKER, B.A., and the EDITOR.

'Its spiritual passion is rich and contagious, and is reinforced by amplitude of learning gathered from courageous philosophy and scientific research. Readers will gratefully acknowledge no little benefit from the air which the book brings from uplands of thought sanctified by memoirs of Martineau.'—*Dundee Advertiser*.

Crown 8vo. Stiff Covers, **2s. 6d.** net.

Nonconformist Church Music.

By JOSEPH WOOD.

The Rev. W. GARRETT HORDER writes: 'It is an excellent little manual to put into the hands of organists, choirmasters, and all responsible for the conduct of worship in the Free Churches.'

'Much sound sense and good illustration in small compass.'

Baptist Times.

'This book certainly deserves to go into a second edition.'

The Choir.

LINDSEY PRESS, 5 Essex Street, Strand, London, W.C. 2.

The Life of Arthur Thomas Guttery

D.D.

By JOHN G. BOWRAN

WITH A PREFACE BY THE PRIME MINISTER |
(THE RIGHT HON. DAVID LLOYD GEORGE)

Dr. Guttery was the most popular Primitive Methodist Minister of his day. He was a leader of the Free Churches and a great social and political reformer. The Prime Minister has described him as one of the most wonderful orators he had ever heard. The Rev. J. G. Bowran was one of Dr. Guttery's closest friends. With fulness of knowledge and sympathy he has written this 'life.' The biography will be an inspiration for many years.

Large Crown 8vo. Illustrated. **5s.** net.

The Hebrew Prophet and the Modern Preacher

BY

HENRY J. PICKETT

'This book has been written under the pressure of a deep and ever-deepening conviction that our supreme need in this twentieth century is a truly prophetic ministry, and that the man who stands in the pulpit should always realise that his only right to be there rests upon an obligation he cannot evade, to be "a Speaker for God."'

Large Crown 8vo. **5s.** net.

HOLBORN PUBLISHING HOUSE
HOLBORN HALL, CLERKENWELL ROAD, LONDON, E.C. 1

T. & T. CLARK'S ANNOUNCEMENTS FOR AUTUMN 1922

RELIGION AND MODERN THOUGHT.

[Ready in October]

By PRINCIPAL GEORGE GALLOWAY, D.Phil., D.D., St. Mary's College, St. Andrews.
Author of 'The Philosophy of Religion' (*International Theological Library*); 'The Idea of Immortality: Its Development and Value.'

The problems dealt with are those which modern thinking raises in reference to religion and theology. In this age of perplexity and unrest there is much dispute and doubt about the truth and value of what is traditional in theory and practice. Many who are not hostile to religion itself desire to see religious ideas and doctrines revised and brought into harmony with modern thought. This tendency has been accentuated by the wide unsettlement, social and intellectual, due to the war and its effects. The underlying need which thus expresses itself is real and intelligible, and it was much before the mind of the author.

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS:

[Ready in October]

Its Doctrine and Significance.

By PROFESSOR E. F. SCOTT, D.D., Union Theological Seminary, New York.
Author of 'The Fourth Gospel: Its Purpose and Theology'; 'The Kingdom and the Messiah.'

This Epistle, for all its air of antiquity, makes a peculiar appeal to the mind of our own age. It deals with questions which are ultimately the same as those which are now perplexing us, and suggests answers to them which are still valid. This has been felt by many, in all the Christian Churches, who vaguely perceive the drift of the argument but cannot follow it in detail. Recent commentaries, while they have illuminated many dark places in the Epistle, have been warped in their approach to it by the old prepossessions, and have thereby overlooked some of its essential aspects. There is need, therefore, for this new exposition.

THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF PEACE.

[Ready in October]

(A New Volume in 'The Great Christian Doctrines' Series.)

Edited by the REV. JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

The British Weekly is printing Dr. J. H. JOWETT's impressions of the Copenhagen Conference. Delegates from every land testified that there is a great silent world of men and women yearning for peace, but unable to demonstrate their desires or to make their Governments hear or heed. It is for the Churches to give expression to this need. Instruction in the principles of peace must come from the pulpit. Peace must be the chief topic of preaching. To serve as the basis of this all important subject this new volume has been prepared. It deals in a thoroughly practical manner with the whole Biblical Doctrine of Peace.

THE LOCAL COLOUR OF THE BIBLE:

[Ready in October]

Genesis—II Samuel.

By CHARLES W. BUDDEN, M.D., and the REV. EDWARD HASTINGS, M.A.

The books of the first half of the Old Testament are all dealt with separately. The manners, customs, and mode of life of the Jews of the various periods are described in a graphic yet concise style, which cannot fail to be of great service to Sunday School Teachers and all who endeavour to present living pictures of the Old Testament to the minds of the young.

THE SCOTTISH CHURCH, 1500—1920:

A Graphic Chart.

By ROBERT ADAMS, Assistant City Librarian, Glasgow.

In two styles (a) Cloth varnished, mounted on rollers for hanging, 30 in. x 40 in. }
(b) Paper, folded in Stiff Paper Case, }

[Ready in October]

This Chart shows at a glance, after the manner of a genealogical tree, the ramifications of Scottish Church History. The study of this difficult subject is now greatly simplified and its absorbing interest enhanced. This Chart is sure to be widely welcomed.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN LIFE AND BEHAVIOUR.

[In the Press]

By the REV. W. S. BRUCE, D.D.

Author of 'The Formation of Christian Character,' 'The Ethics of the Old Testament.'

The main object of this book is to vindicate for Christian experience its reality as a normal and a healthy part of human nature. Religious experience can adduce its own facts and submit them to scientific analysis. They have a value and authority of their own which it is the privilege of Psychology to unveil. The study of the effects of these experiences on individuals of different temperaments is of the utmost importance for all ministers, teachers, and evangelists, and should greatly help them in their difficult work.

THE PARERGA OF

WILLIAM HONYMAN GILLESPIE.

5s. net

By JAMES URQUHART, F.S.A.(Scot.). With an Appreciation of Gillespie by the VERY REV. PROFESSOR W. P. PATERSON, D.D., LL.D. Demy 8vo. 435 pp.

Gillespie's miscellaneous writings will appeal to some who find his "Argument a Priori" beyond their capacity, and will also seem to some who have grasped the argument to be the more interesting if not also the more valuable contribution. The "Parerga" were worth reproducing if only as an illustration of the way in which the negative movements of the nineteenth century were met by a Scotsman who combined masculine ability and absorbing intellectual interests with an evangelical inheritance and personal religion.

accept all the author's conclusions or not, will appreciate his extensive researches.

J. G. TASKER.

Handsworth College, Birmingham.

The New Strasbourg.

STRASBOURG has had a change of masters, and its University has been affected by the change. The reorganized seat of learning appears to be making a strong effort to achieve for itself a 'place in the sun,' and it seems to us that it is in a very fair way to do so. An extraordinary literary and scholarly activity is in progress. The mere extent of the published programme is amazing. Fine fruits have been yielded already, and more are in prospect. Mere quantity, of course, goes for little, but if we may judge by the samples we have received, the quality delights no less than the quantity surprises. We have one from what in this country would be known as the Faculty of Arts, and one from the Protestant Faculty of Theology.

I.

The former is a collection of Essays on Medieval Philosophy by Étienne Gilson, Professor of the History of Philosophy.¹ In the phrase 'medieval philosophy' each word constitutes a problem. When exactly did the Middle Ages end? and had that period a philosophy in anything like the modern sense at all? To the former no easy answer can be given. There is no year which can be taken as a watershed between medieval and modern times. History knows little of sharp distinctions. To-day, even if it be a day of revolution, still bears some features of yesterday, its parent. Most true is that of the history of thought. And Gilson is right in finding that while medievalism extends its grasp as far as Descartes—please note, *Descartes*, not *Cartesianism*—Modernism, on the other hand, has its roots far back in the introduction to Europe of the Sciences by the Arabs. Can we speak of the *philosophy* of the Middle Ages? Not quite in the modern sense. But there is one great figure whose 'travail of thought' made philosophy possible and led towards it, and that was Thomas

Aquinas. Round Aquinas and Descartes, therefore, the essays centre. The exposition is clear and thought-provoking; the style is limpid, the whole is most readable. Whether Gilson is discussing the theory of 'double truth,' or Cartesian innate ideas, or the curious controversy of Hervey and Descartes on the circulation of the blood, or Campanella's interesting view of Analogy, he carries one along both by weight of scholarship and lightness of literary touch. It is entertaining to find that while Descartes had the true scientific spirit which prompts a search for 'real causes' in explaining a phenomenon, he lacked the preliminary scientific caution which makes sure that there is a phenomenon to be explained. In consequence he sometimes gave a most satisfying explanation of natural happenings that did not happen at all.

II.

The other is a study of the spiritual development of Luther.² Strohl's study in certain respects confirms Gilson's. Both would have us learn to lay far less stress than we are wont upon the catastrophic significance of the period of the Reformation. Not the 16th but the 18th century marks a new age in the history of European thought, as, indeed, Troeltsch teaches. The Reformation was a very important phenomenon, no doubt, from various points of view, but it does not mark so decisive a breach with the past in the history of the human spirit as we have sometimes held. The Middle Ages, as both Gilson and Strohl show, were busied with one great problem all through: to vindicate a place for human reason as over against the authority of Dogma. The emergence of Lutheranism was not a 'catastrophe' but a 'dénouement.' So, too, in Luther's own spiritual history. It has been too often explained as a series of 'catastrophes.' We have to think rather of gradual developments. Events such as the famous thunderstorm, or the reflexions suggested in Rome as he watched the Santa Scala, have been very much exaggerated and given a picturesque importance which they do not deserve. At the best they gave a little added impulse to a movement already in progress in his spirit. That the Santa Scala had any real influence at all is very doubtful.

¹ *Études de Philosophie Médiévale*, pp. 292. Strasbourg, 1921; Eng. agent, Mr. Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press.

² *L'Évolution Religieuse de Luther, jusqu'en 1515*, Henri Strohl, pp. 174. Strasbourg et Paris, 1922.

It is difficult to avoid the appearance of fulsomeness in attempting to estimate this penetrating and illuminating study of Luther. Were it only for the careful and discriminating discussion of recent literature, both Catholic and Protestant, the book would be indispensable to students. Recent literature, be it said, is all that a student needs, and the quantity of it is very great. The War interfered with our knowledge of a good deal of it. The main problems of Luther's earlier years are such as: Why did he become a monk? what was the nature of the bitter conflict of soul which distressed him, until about 1515 he found peace? how did he attain peace? and what precisely is signified by his 'discovery of the gospel'? These questions are put and answered in a way that is convincing. A further study of Luther is promised. We look forward to it with expectation and impatience.

'What ails ministers nowadays at the Song of Solomon? They never mention it, even at the Lord's Table.' Such was the query of a venerable elder who firmly believed that the column-headings in our A.V.—'The mutual love of Christ and His Church,' etc.—were part of the inspired text. Well, what about the Song? The allegorical view, first questioned by Herder, has gone. The view that it is a drama of sorts has gone too. Is it, as Haupt holds, a mere collection of love-ditties? No, says Thilo, it is not a mere anthology. The pearls are not separate, they are on a string. The whole is a unity and subserves a great ethical purpose which justifies its retention in the Canon.¹ According to Thilo the Song traces the development of love from the first awaking of 'soft desire' to wedded bliss. It marks an epoch in the history of morality and social progress, as teaching thus artistically a true conception of woman as a person not a chattel, and pointing the way to monogamy. This little work has a value out of all proportion to its size. The translation is striking and excellent. A few passages, such as that about the mysterious 'chariots of Amminadab,' are frankly given up as beyond skill to divine the sense.

If there is to be canonization at all, Jeanne D'Arc deserved it more than some of the semi-

¹ *Das Hohelied neu übersetzt u. ästhetisch-sittlich erklärt*, Lic. Dr. Martin Thilo, pp. 48. Bonn, 1921.

mythical and thaumaturgic personages who have the prefix 'Saint' in the calendars of the Eastern and Western Churches. The story of one whose faith and purity of soul guarded her as with a wall of fire amid a rough soldiery in camps and bivouacs cannot be told too often, and as a strictly historical record it is well told by Father L. H. Petitot, O.P.²

The author does not attempt any theory of the psychical problems of the 'prophetic' preparation of the stage on which the 'panoplied maid' appeared, or of the 'voices' which directed her. Nor does he mention the curious tale of a lady whom some took to be Jeanne years after the execution. When he hazards the opinion that, but for Jeanne, France might have been Protestant, he will not expect us to share his enthusiasm, but, frankly, we doubt very much the probability of this.

We reverence Jeanne so much that it hurts to find her deathless story set forth in such poor outward form, on bad paper, with narrow margins, and so many misprints.

Italian translations of the Scriptures have been few. There have been only two versions of the whole. That of Diodati was good in its day; that of Martini was always mediocre; both need amendment. But a new translation is being published. One scholar is translating and annotating and writing introductions to the entire Scriptures, including the Apocrypha. It is Professor Giovanni Luzzi. He has undertaken a big task, but to judge by his *Genesi con una Introduzione Generale al Pentateuco* (pp. 149, Firenze) he is doing it right well. He places before the '*lettore di media coltura*' in simple form the generally accepted view of modern scholars as to the composition of the Pentateuch, and indicates in the margin what parts are from *J*, *E*, *P*, or *JE*. The notes are to the point. The book is beautifully illustrated with maps and pictures of antiquities which we note are reproduced from the publications of the Oxford University Press. We wish the Professor all success in his great enterprise. The Publishers appeal to the Italian public, 'If you have a library, add to it the Bible; if you can have only one book, let it be the Bible.' Splendid!

W. D. NIVEN.

Aberdeen.

² *Sainte Jeanne D'Arc*, pp. 504. Paris, 1921.

Wobbermin.¹

THIS solid and interesting work forms the second volume of Wobbermin's 'Systematic Theology,' the first having appeared in 1913. Like its predecessor, it is full of knowledge, fairness, and good sense, and may well rank as a standard book of reference about the recent discussions of its subject. Schleiermacher is throughout the point of departure; Wobbermin aspires, not improperly, to continue and develop the master's work. We again hear much of the religio-psychological method as the only right one; but by this, let us note, is not meant the method of the empirical psychology of religion, but a sustained attempt to elicit the specifically religious element in experience, interpreted in the light of one's own religious life, and especially to get at the inner meaning of religious conviction and the crucial interest of the religious man in the *truth* of his beliefs. Emphasis is laid upon the fact that a purely historical comparison of the faiths of mankind gives us no real help in fixing what in them is strictly religious, and not rather to be put down to the account of magic and mythology. To the question, *e.g.*, Is animism a religion? it affords no reply.

From a book of such compass I can only select a few matters of more than usual significance. The author brings out freshly a point on which much has lately been written, viz. that in Schleiermacher 'feeling' denotes a mode of apprehension, and is no mere subjective state of mind. God, the Infinite, is for it an immediate object, not simply the term of a causal inference. Its nature is conceived as the opposite of rational reflexion *about* feeling. Wobbermin holds that to define religion as the feeling of utter dependence means that in the last resort our definition of religion need not include the word 'God,' and that thus we escape from a circle. But do we want to escape? I cannot myself see that Wobbermin's repeated assertion that not 'God' but 'a higher world' is the true object of the religious relation comes to very much, more especially if Luther is right in saying, in famous words, that 'a God means what one looks to for all good and makes a refuge in all trouble.' This is wide enough to cover all genuine

religions; and if Buddhism is properly a religion, as Wobbermin contends, it will somehow cover it also. Religion and God imply each other, and the circle is inescapable because religious experience has to be assumed. Still, in spite of previous workers, there is something that is original and much that is wholly satisfying in this new discussion of Schleiermacher's basal ideas. It is good to have it proved that the great pioneer is not a 'subjectivistic' thinker, as many of us have been wont to say, largely by his own fault. He did not really isolate feeling; and in feeling, or immediate self-consciousness, God for him is *given*, and need not be searched for as the ground of this or that.

It is, however, necessary to build higher on Schleiermacher's foundations, and in proceeding to this Wobbermin enters on a careful study of Mysticism. He rejects Heiler's view that Mysticism involves the radical negation alike of the Ego and the world; not even in Eckhart is there anything of that kind. What Christian mystics at all events have aimed at is the closest possible relation of unity between the soul and God. The unity is at the same time a relation. Buddhism holds a unique place in the history of religions, for the question can quite fairly be put whether it is a religion at all. Wobbermin decides in its favour, on the ground largely that Nirvana is essentially positive in content, though this, of course, has been denied. I am not sure that Wobbermin's argument on the point takes account sufficiently of the fact that even although a state were conceived as purely negative—as Nirvana probably was—yet it could not be *described* at all except at the cost of importing certain positive elements into the description. He is right, however, in urging that what led Buddhism into inextricable difficulties was the conflict within it of belief in a higher world with a thoroughly sceptical metaphysic.

Eventually, after refuting various efforts to deny the transcendent reference of piety, Wobbermin defines religion in these terms: 'The essence of religion consists in the attitude and relation of man to a Higher World—a world in which he believes, whose reality he divines in his belief, and on which he feels himself dependent.' The feeling of dependence is the deepest thing, but to it Wobbermin further attaches the feeling of 'protectedness' and the feeling of 'longing.' These

¹ *Das Wesen der Religion*. By Georg Wobbermin, Dr. phil. et theol., Professor in Heidelberg. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1921. Pp. viii, 499. Price 11s. 6d. (paper covers); 15s. 6d. (bound).

two last items represent an advance, he holds, on Schleiermacher. From the first flows the sense of obligation, from the second the impulse after blessedness. Otto is censured for abstracting wholly from morality in his wish to reach the purely religious fact; for, says Wobbermin convincingly, religion itself contains the sense of being bound to an unseen power, as is proved by the existence of prayer and sacrifice.

We cannot pause over the author's new proposals for the classification of religions. In this connexion he returns to the subject of Mysticism, pleading that as an independent form it is to be carefully distinguished from the mystical element found in every religion, and that it is not necessarily pantheistic. Ritschl's handling of the problem is now seen to have been lop-sided. In the *Bhagavad-gita* personalism and pantheistic mysticism move side by side unharmonized. While not pantheistic in fibre, Mysticism does impair the feeling of dependence and is in tendency hostile to the idea of mediation. All this is richly illustrated from the sacred books of India. In sum, Buddhism, Mysticism, and Pantheism may be described as special forms of the contemplative religion of redemption.

Wobbermin, then, enters on the problem of the truth of religion, studied in the light of its essence. Here the supreme thing is to discover and clarify the evidences of validity to be found in religion itself. All hangs on the question whether the 'higher world,' with which the believer feels himself to be in relation, is real or illusory. In an important passage it is laid down that any scientific proof of the being of God can be only indirect: objections can be refuted, it can be shown that explanations of faith which assume its emptiness and untruth are themselves unsound; and attention can be drawn to various aspects of science, morality, and art which only become intelligible if the religious hypothesis be accepted. Lang and Schmidt's theory of a primitive monotheism is rightly bowed out, on the ground that Christian influence had already touched the supposed data: this is a masterly section. Religion and magic, originally mixed up, are distinguished for familiar reasons. Leuba's attempt to discredit religion by a *petitio principii* is dealt with faithfully, though the

counter-argument is rather loose. Among the best passages in this part of the work are scrutinies of Feuerbach's classic statement of illusionism, Lubbock's view that there are tribes wholly devoid of religious practice, Natorp's effort to state religion solely in humanitarian terms, and Vaihinger's able but unavailing contention that Kant can be quoted for the *Als-ob* philosophy. In concluding chapters it is urged that recent natural science is markedly teleological in tendency, and that religion as such is neither friendly to civilization nor hostile, but critical. The link which binds science and morality to religion is humility in presence of that which is infinite and commanding, be it the system of nature or the sublime fact of duty.

It may be suggested to Wobbermin and a host of present-day writers to consider whether the habit of describing religion as essentially 'irrational' has not been carried too far. No one would deny that the term contains some truth; faith is supra-logical, in the sense that there is always more in religious experience than can be turned into transparent theory. But after all there is a wider and larger sense of reason for which religion is no more irrational than morality is. Hedonism regards the categorical imperative of duty as irrational, and to this there is no reply, if we start with a hedonistic view of ethical reason. Besides, why call that 'irrational' which alone imparts *meaning*, in the ultimate sense, to human life and history. The confusions of the fashionable terminology come out with startling clearness in the following sentence: 'The core of religion, though for the individual it invariably signifies a wholly irrational fact of life, must from the supreme point of view rank as in harmony with reason' (p. 457).

The work as a whole is one of great value, and one feels it is bound to wear well. It represents the kind of middle position, between stiff conservatism and revolutionary caprice, to which a judicious mind, fully aware of the long previous discussions, may to-day come. We look forward with anticipation to the next volume, in which the author will attack the great problem of the Essence of Christianity.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

New College, Edinburgh.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

A Visit to a Picture House.

'That ye may be sincere.'—Ph 1¹⁰.

ARE you fond of the Picture House? Rather, you say. You just love to settle down in the cosy chair in the dark, and forget all about maths. and Latin verbs, and get carried far away to the ends of the earth, among Red Indians and Mexicans, and galloping horses, and men with rifles cracking, and terribly exciting things, till all at once the lights go up and you waken up to be yourself again. Well, there's a splendid picture house that is always open; and there's no price to pay; not even half-price. You can go in when you like, and sit as long as you care, and the programme doesn't ever begin over again, runs on and on, and always new. Would you care to come? Well! what's the name of the picture house that you like best. This one is called the Dictionary. Ach! you say; I thought it was a real one. And so it is. It is just full of splendid pictures for those with eyes to see. Take that word 'astonished.' Shut your eyes, and think out what it means, until you see it all. There's a knot of travellers in a wild country, no shelter anywhere, and look how black the sky has grown! and what a pélt of rain! Look at it coming down in bucketfuls. You see one of them has run under that tree, it's rather drier there. But ah! did you see that?—that blinding flash of lightning. Why, it has struck the tree, and the man too. To be astonished is to be thunder-struck.

Quite a good film, isn't it?

Or turn the pages; here's a word you often use—'companion.' And here's the new film beginning to run. This time it's a barracks, and there are soldiers everywhere, rough fellows, old and scarred, that have been through many a scrap and many an adventure. Among them is a young lad newly joined, a raw recruit, looking a bit out of it and far from home, and shy. But, you see that? There's a decent fellow who has made up to him, and is showing him the ropes, what to do, and not to do; and you see he is taking out a hunk of bread and is halving it with the youngster. That's what a companion means, one who shares his bread with you. And that's the picture there.

Or do you know the word 'trivial.' It means petty, or little, or small. Look, here's a good film coming! There's a woman going marketing; how she bustles along; she's in a desperate hurry, wants to get back to her baby and her washing and her house. You see she has reached the cross-roads where three streets meet; she's crossing; she has met another woman coming up one of the other roads; she stands still, both of them do. They've begun to talk; they put down their baskets; they stand a long, long time with their heads and tongues going hard. Why, here's a third one coming up the third road, and she stops too, and she speaks just as much as the others: nod, nod, nod, go the three heads; chatter, chatter, chatter, go the three tongues; and it's all about nothing. Trivial means chatter about nothing at the cross-roads.

It's a good picture house, and here is a good picture! You know that word 'sincere.' It means honest, or thorough, or without sham and pretence. But first of all it meant 'without wax,' *sine cera* in the Latin. And what is the picture there? I think this is a funny one. There's a man eating honey, and he likes it, that's plain. But what's wrong? His face is all twisted; he's got hold of something horrid; he's calling for water to put away the taste. Some honey has a wax that is very bitter, and if you come upon a bit of that it's nasty. And 'sincere' is without wax, is honey through and through. So a sincere boy means one who is honest altogether, who is all the real thing, who has no lumps of horridness in him, now and then, and here and there; no untruths at times, no bad tempers, no ill humours that flame out unexpectedly, no falsehoods to get out of scrapes. My honey is sincere, the old shopman used, perhaps, to say. There is no bitter wax in it. I wonder can your Father make that boast of you? My boy and my girl are sincere, have no nastinesses mingling with the nice things in them.

But others think that is not really the picture here at all. Go to another picture house, and when sincere is put on you won't see that one about the honey but this other one instead. The word sincere means without wax. Both the Greeks and the Romans used a word like that. And

there's a Greek word for sincere that means tested by the sun. And what's the picture there? Long ago folk were very fond of statues; they had them in their churches, they had them in their houses, they had them in their gardens, they had them everywhere. And some people couldn't afford very dear and expensive ones. And so the makers of them had a cheaper kind. They weren't bad. To look at them you would say they were as good every bit as the dearer ones. But these really weren't as good as they looked—were made of a poor stone, with little cracks, and small flaws, and discoloured bits in it. And what they did was to chip out these ugly pieces of the stone, and then fill up the holes and cracks with wax just the same colour as the marble, and when it was all finished it seemed splendid. People looked at it and said, There's a fine statue! I wish I could buy it! Why, how cheap it is! I can afford it! And they bought it, and were very proud of it. But when they put it in their garden and a hot day came, the sun melted the wax, and the cracks showed.

And sometimes a great statue by a famous sculptor got chipped and broken a little bit. And the owner put wax in it and stood it in a shady corner where the sun never reached it, and no one knew.

But when he died the statue might go to the market to be sold, and somebody would buy it and be proud to have so glorious a statue made by such a famous artist, but when he put it in his garden the sun showed the cracks when the hidden wax melted away. It wasn't genuine, not through and through; it wasn't sincere. And so when people bought a statue they would say, I'll take it if it is sincere, if there's no wax about it.

Well, what about you? You look a nice girl and a straight, clean boy. But I wonder if you really are all that you look. Mother and Father believe in you, but, I wonder, did you go to bed just when you promised them you would, or did you wait up till you had read on to the chapter's end, and kept telling yourself it's all right, the old clock must have gone fast? I wonder were you asleep when Mother went round; or had you been having a pillow fight five seconds before? Perhaps Mother thought—though she said nothing—that you looked a little bit too innocent and sleepy, that your pillow was very crushed and rumpled, went away a wee bit sore at heart because her boy

could try to deceive her. I wonder if there are no cracks, no wax, no pretence, no sham. I wonder lots of things.

When people write a letter they end up 'Yours sincerely.' That means, This is an honest letter, everything in it is quite true, you can depend on it. If it weren't so there could be no business, for we couldn't trust each other. Remember you are writing a long letter; every day you add another sentence—for it is your life. And every night can you sign it 'Yours sincerely,' and your name? Can you say everything that I have said, and everything that I have done, and all my work, and all my thoughts and all my words to-day have been honest, true, above-board, sincere, with no wax or sham in them?

Have you a Receiving Set?

'Here am I; for thou didst call me.'—1 Sam. 3^d.

Has Dad been telling you about the newest things in wireless—about those queer messages that come without wires and poles? I think it's rather like when you shy a stone into a pool, and the eddies go rippling out and out until they reach the bank all round. And so when people speak, they send out waves into the air, and the wise men catch them, tap them, translate them back into words again. And now they are going to give people a Receiving Set; and every night they are going to flash out from 5 to 11 those messages that they have caught, and sitting in your house you will be able to hear a singer in Edinburgh, or a speaker in London, hear whether your particular favourite among the football or the cricket teams has lost or won, though it was playing far away.

It's a queer thing, isn't it, that these messages are flashing about everywhere. But we don't hear, because we have no Receiving Set.

Yes, but there are far more wonderful messages flying about. Always God is speaking, telling us what to do, or showing us the way to do it, helping us when we are in a fix, calling out to us, when we are tempted, to be brave and true. And the churches are just the centres where they catch and pick up these messages, and 'broadcast' them, fling them out again for every one to hear. And some do hear, but some don't, because they have no Receiving Set. You know the bonnie story of old Eli in the Temple lying fast asleep and hearing

nothing: and Samuel, the little lad who couldn't help hearing a voice that talked to him quite plainly; how the old man at first was puzzled about it, said it was all nonsense, that there was nothing to be heard, but by and by saw what it meant. God was speaking, and the boy had a Receiving Set, and so could hear; while he himself had none, or had lost his, or broken it.

Wouldn't it be splendid to have a Receiving Set, to hear God speak to us! Well, you can have it, if you like. It costs nothing at all. Ask God your Father for it and He'll love to give it you. And we can't get it any other way. It's a wonderful present, but He never grudges anything, will give you even this. And the Receiving Set with which we hear God is called Faith. That bores you, doesn't it? When the man in the pulpit begins talking about faith, you just stop listening; are far away, at school, or in the playing field, or in the country wandering again up the stream where you caught your biggest trout; but mother is listening with all her ears. She is interested in His Wireless. She wants to hear God speak, she thinks the faith that makes it possible is the most wonderful and splendid thing in all the world, far more wonderful than electricity, or radium, or anything else. Don't you think you would like one of these sets? Wouldn't you care to hear the messages from God coming through? What kind of things does God say? Well, here's one He keeps sending through. If you had a Receiving Set you would hear this. You know how difficult it is to stand up to things, not to sulk, not to grow grumpy in a losing game, how hard to be true when you are in a hole. If you had a Receiving Set at such times you would hear God sending this message, Hold on, don't give in, all Heaven is hurrying to help you. I remember lying in a Pill Box up behind Passchendale out in the War, when a tremendous barrage was let loose on us, hours of it. The Pill Box was hit, and hit again, it shook like a jelly, and all the candles were blown out, and still the shells came on; until at last the colonel ordered the adjutant to phone back to Brigade Headquarters to get the British guns turned on. By and by, back came the word that the message had been sent back to the gunners, a little longer and word came along the wire that they had got it and were getting ready. Cheer up, they said, we'll settle them for you. A little longer, and far and far away came the dull

boom of guns, and the shells went whistling and screaming over us. And then one felt far better. Before, we had felt lonely and cut off there with the enemy doing much as he liked with us, but that message told us we were not alone, had the whole British Empire at our back, and so, if you had a Receiving Set and listened when you are tempted, you would find out that you aren't just a small boy or girl left all alone to stand up to your tempter, but that you have God behind you. 'Cheer up,' He says, 'don't give in, I'll settle it for you,' and with that His guns begin to fire, and the enemy is silenced.

The Christian Year.

EIGHTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Christianity and Politics.

'As free, and not using your freedom for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king.'—
I P 2^{16, 17}.

Christianity has very much to do with the great principles of political and social questions. You will not, indeed, as a rule, find its teaching expressly and formally directed to national life at all. For the stock examples of patriotism and love of freedom we still quote the worthies of ancient Greece and Rome. For the Scriptural examples of deep love of country and loyalty to its head, we still turn to the pages of the Old Testament, as in the cry, 'If I forget thee, O Jerusalem, let my right hand forget her cunning.' 'O pray for the peace of Jerusalem; they shall prosper that love thee.' But this results partly from the circumstances under which the New Testament was written, partly from the great ideas which it had to enunciate. If we look to circumstances, we observe that, when the Gospel was first preached, it was addressed to those who, under the universal despotism of Rome, had lost all opportunity of free national life. If we look to what is of infinitely more consequence—the essential spirit and glory of the Gospel—we see that it has to deal with universal and eternal principles, identified with no forms of social and political life, able to rule and inspire all, yet bound up essentially with none. But yet, under the sway of these principles, the nation has become what in the first days it was not—the unit of human Society. The national life in every Christian

country has developed itself with a singular intensity of power; and the fire of patriotism and loyalty has burnt all the more brightly, because the Gospel has broken down the barriers which seemed to guard, but tended to choke it, and has let in upon it the free air of heaven. The power of the Gospel has always been directed to give life to great universal principles, leaving them to work for themselves in all their natural spheres of action, whether the family, the nation, or the race.

Is this not so in the case before us? The three great requisites for political life are the love of freedom, the spirit of loyalty, and the enthusiasm of brotherhood, or patriotism. See with what singular simplicity and vividness these are brought out to us in the words of the text!

1. *The spirit of freedom*—‘as free, and not using liberty for a cloak of maliciousness, but as the servants of God.’ Note here the true spirit of freedom in the assertion of our own rights and liberty of action, not for ‘maliciousness’—not (that is) for our own selfish purposes, or even for the wantonness of reckless exercise; but ‘for the service of God,’ that is, for the glorious privilege of fellow-working with Him, and in that fellowship of following the Lord Jesus Christ, by devotion to the happiness and goodness of His creatures. What could better describe the social and political aspect of freedom, as it is concerned not with our own individual work in life, but with the part which we are called upon to take in the great life of our nation? It is, indeed, thus only that it can be preserved; thus only can it be a blessing to the world. If once an individual, a class, a nation, which has been made free, either in an indolent or cowardly tameness cares not to assert its freedom, or in a spirit of maliciousness asserts it simply as a means of wealth and ease, of glory and power, then has it fallen from its birthright of glorious liberty; and history confirms the sentence of Holy Scripture, that it shall be, as it deserves to be, ‘a servant of servants,’ a slave of slaves.

2. *The spirit of loyalty*—‘Fear God. Honour the king.’ The two principles seldom are, never ought to be, separate. If the king is honoured, being himself a mere man, it must be because God is feared; because (in the grand words of the Old Testament) the king is ‘the Lord’s anointed,’ or (as the New Testament more philosophically extends the idea) ‘the powers that be are ordained as vicegerents of God.’ Never, of course, can they

be absolute vicegerents. There is to us but one Supreme King, the Lord Jesus Christ Himself. All other authorities, whether in Church or State, are simply His imperfect representatives. But yet they are true vicegerents. They act under limitations, which they may not pass, under laws which are based on right, and not on arbitrary will; so fulfilling the purpose of God’s Providence; so bearing a large share of the burden of humanity. Therefore, they claim at our hands, for His sake, true loyalty; which implies (be it remembered) not only obedience but reverence, not only duty but love. It is impossible not to remind ourselves that to us, far more than to those whom St. Peter addressed, that precept should come home. For he wrote to men who were living under a foreign despotism, wielding as its sceptre a ruthless sword. He wrote at a time when that sceptre was swayed by a Nero, with hands soon to be deeply stained, through mere cruelty and slanderous recklessness, with Christian blood. We have a rule over us, which is, in the truest sense, representative of the free life of the people; and that peaceful and righteous rule is at this moment invested, by the unanimous testimony of all, with the sacredness of deep personal reverence. Well, indeed, is it for us. For never can a country prosper, unless the chief authority be hedged round with reverence. Never will it greatly prosper, if that reverence be untinted by some glow of love.

3. But beyond freedom and loyalty there is *the spirit of brotherhood*. ‘Honour all men’—give (that is) to all, high and low, the respect, the consideration, the rights which are their due. In these words we trace the spirit of humility and forbearance, deference and respect for others, which limits the self-assertion of the strong individual, or the overwhelming majority. ‘Love the brotherhood’—in these words breathes the spirit of enthusiastic self-sacrifice for the whole community, which counts self as a little thing, which esteems it a joy and a privilege to live and to die for all.

It is true that these commands are not confined to the body politic. The first extends far beyond it, to the whole race of man. The second looks especially to the brotherhood of the Christian Church, of which one essential characteristic is that it is Catholic or Universal, co-extensive in capacity and promise with all humanity. Nor shall we fail to discover that this truth is of great

significance, in preventing that absolute absorption in social and political interests which degrades our own highest humanity, and that idolatry of patriotism to one single country which may easily become inhuman to others. But, nevertheless, the principles of this deference and self-sacrifice must apply, in its right measure and degree, to every community of which we are members; and certainly in no doubtful application to the nation, especially if it be a free nation and therefore a true brotherhood. We cannot call Christianity a religion of equality. For equality is a dangerously ambiguous word; in one sense it is a sacred and priceless truth; and in another it is an unnatural and impossible figment. But the other two names of the famous triad it certainly may assume. It is unquestionably a religion of liberty and fraternity; yet a liberty restrained and tempered by loyalty; a fraternity recognizing one Almighty Father, and so reverencing all who bear mission from Him. There can hardly be nobler elements of the true political life. They can hardly be more plainly taught, more vividly enforced, than in the pages of the New Testament. How, therefore, if we are Christians indeed, can we fail to rekindle at the altar of our Christianity the undying fire of high social and political aspiration?

NINETEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Temptations of Middle Life.

'In the midst of the years.'—Hab 3².

What are the temptations that especially assail the middle-aged?

1. One of the most obvious is the hardening of the mental tissue. It is a familiar saying that a man is as old as his arteries. When these begin to harden old age is at hand, and death is not far behind. And there is an intellectual sclerosis that is the forerunner of intellectual death. And just as a wise man will seek by wise means to ward off the physical peril, so it is the duty of those who have passed the mid-time of their years to watch against the stiffening of their mental joints, to keep their minds hospitable to new ideas. We are not called to make our own all the new thoughts of a new time; we are called to meet them with understanding and with charity, and to resist the temptation through sheer inertia to throw ourselves unthinkingly on the side of things as they are. I can recall no better illustration of how

this may be done than the late Dr. John Shaw Banks. I was not one of his students, nor was I ever personally intimate with him. If one may judge from his writings, his natural leanings were all towards the older, more conservative schools of thought. Yet I never listened to him without feeling that behind the rather ungainly manner of his speech there lay a hospitality of soul that was truly regal. He kept his intellectual sympathies alive and alert to the last, and so perpetually was the miracle of renewal wrought in him that when he died, over eighty years of age though he was, the younger ministers of his Church felt that they had lost in him, not only a father, but a brother.

2. Another temptation of middle life is to yield to the spirit of weariness. In part, of course, it is due to causes that are beyond our control. As life goes on we tire more easily, the fire burns less brightly. It was said of Adam Clarke that his heart to the last leapt up when he beheld a rainbow in the sky. But most men are not so fortunate; they have to confess themselves powerless against the years. And sometimes our weariness springs from disappointed hopes. Once we thought the prize was to be ours; now we know that, here at least, we shall never be crowned. When we set out on the journey we expected to go far; now we know that the top of the road has been reached, and that for the rest of the way it will dip steadily towards the twilight and the darkness. Why, then, should we concern ourselves? Toil and trouble, trouble and toil—what is the good of it all? There are few men, I suppose, in their fifties who have not known that evil mood.

3. And then close behind weariness comes cynicism, the temper of the man who has persuaded himself of what Mrs. Humphry Ward calls 'the uselessness of utterance, the futility of enthusiasm, the inaccessibility of the ideal, the practical absurdity of trying to realise any of the mind's inward dreams.' That is the cynical temper, and we know how it works. It has not only put out its own fire, but it has its bucket of water always handy for the fire of another. Above all it loves to frown down the generous enthusiasms of eager youth: 'Ah! so I thought when I was your age.' Of all evil spirits that can possess a man I wonder if that is not the damnablest. And middle age in the pulpit may fall its victim as readily as middle age in the pew. A youth leaves college all aglow with splendid ambitions to set a

wrong world right; but at fifty the vision has faded; he is content to let things take their course, sure that he at least can do nothing to mend them. And so you get that deadly paralysis in which routine is maintained only by force of habit—the abomination of desolation in the Church of the living God. It was that kind of thing in other walks of life that led Dr. Osler to declare that a man was ‘too old at forty,’ and that after sixty he should be quietly put away. But there is no need that these things should be. Even in the midst of the years it is still possible to be gaining new interests and forming new ties; we may still refuse to faint or be discouraged; so that even when the end comes it may find us, like Gladstone and Booth and Clifford, still dreaming our dreams and seeing our visions, and in the strength of them doing many wondrous works.¹

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Race of Life.

‘Therefore let us also, seeing we are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses, lay aside every weight, and the sin which doth so easily beset us, and let us run with patience the race that is set before us, looking unto Jesus the author and perfecter of our faith.’—Heb 12^{1, 2}.

This passage presents to our imaginations a scene which was familiar to the people of that age, and especially to those who had been present at the great games of Greece or had heard them described. The games always included a foot race; and a foot race then was very much what it is now. The competitors were obliged to put themselves in training. Strict temperance was indispensable for any one who hoped to do well in the race. When the hour came, the course was cleared, and the eager spectators placed themselves where they thought they would best be able to watch the runners. These presented themselves at the starting-point, stripped of all but the lightest and least cumbersome clothing. They saw before them the goal for which they were to make. When they were started, they aimed at going as directly as they could towards the goal, and they were stimulated by the shouts of the spectators to put forth their utmost efforts.

In the Epistle to the Hebrews the writer compares himself and his fellow-Christians to these runners in a race. They were compassed about,

he says, by a great cloud of witnesses. He means by witnesses persons who bore witness to the faithfulness of God. He has been giving examples of faith, which he takes from the Old Testament Scriptures. All the faithful men of Jewish history had been bearing witness in various ways to the God in whom they believed—each being ready to say at the end of his life to those around him, ‘Let one more attest, I have lived, seen God’s hand through a lifetime, and all was for best.’ They were so many as to form a multitude like a cloud. A life of faith and service is like a foot-race in this, that we must cast off, for our spiritual effort, whatever would hamper our running. The sin which so easily besets us, or clings round us, must be laid aside. And further, as the eyes of runners are fixed on the goal, so for our spiritual course there is an object on which we ought to keep our eyes fixed. Christians are to look to Jesus, the author and perfecter of their faith. In one point the Christian life does *not* resemble a race. We do not want to outstrip and defeat one another: a part of our success, on the contrary, consists in our becoming more able to help one another. The points of resemblance to which our attention is called are these—(1) that we are encouraged by a multitude of our fellow-men, (2) that we have to rid ourselves of what would cumber and hinder us, (3) that we have a course marked out along which we are to run, and (4) that there is an object on which our eyes are to be fixed.

1. Consider with how much greater force an appeal might now be made to a cloud of witnesses. The Israelite was reminded of Abraham and Moses, of David and Samuel, and the prophets; but we have the testimony of Peter and Paul and John, of Stephen and Polycarp and Ignatius. And think what a mass of testimony has been accumulating since those first days! The time would fail us, it would be indeed an endless task, to name the bright examples of Christian faith and heroism—those innumerable stars which make up the milky way of Christian history. We all have the New Testament in our hands; but that volume only covers a generation or two of the Church when it was at its smallest. From each one of the eighteen centuries which have followed the first may be culled records of Christian men and women who for some reason or other have become prominent in the Church, down to those of our own day. Have we not also had the happiness of knowing

¹ G. Jackson, *Reasonable Religion*, p. 47 ff.

personally some good Christians, whose lives were obscure, perhaps, and attracted little observation beyond their own circle, but were manifestly guided and sustained by faith in Christ and the Father? All the steadfast and patient Christians that have ever lived have left their testimony behind them, to be an encouragement and stimulus to others, to point the way, to move us to shame, to assure us that we shall do well to believe and to live like them. Take the hint to value Christian biographies, and to consider reverently the work of faith, and labour of love, and patience of hope, which may be seen in the lives of good Christians.

2. Encouraged by these witnesses, we are called upon to lay aside every weight and the sin which doth so easily beset us. What are the things of which we are to strip ourselves? Anything and everything which would hamper and impede us in the race we are to run. All who have said, 'It is our business to become as holy as possible,' have said rightly: but some in many ages have gone on to say wrongly, what was not said by the first followers of Christ, 'In order to cultivate holiness, we must withdraw ourselves from the world, and rid ourselves of the cares and temptations of family life, of industrial pursuits, of social intercourse.' No, these are not to be renounced: they form part of ourselves, and are rather our flesh and blood than clothes which we put on. The real impediments to be got rid of are sinful dispositions and habits. These things are injurious to our fellow-men and the world in which we live, as well as to ourselves; these cling round the inner man, as wet garments round the swimmer, and prevent him from putting forth his energies. Let the inner man be free and vigorous, and in good training, and he need not fear roughness of the ground or any outward thing that may put itself in his way.

3. There is a race set before us. For each of us there is a course marked out by authority. So far as events are concerned, no one can foresee what his life is to be. The things that happen to us are often very different from what we might have expected. But the principles of the Christian life are sufficiently laid down for us. The essential duties and virtues are the same for all. We all have to be honest, upright, truthful; masters of our appetites and passions; considerate and forbearing, kindly and helpful towards all: and every Christian is to find the way and the power to

fulfil these duties by accepting from God the forgiveness of his sins, and believing in Christ and the Father, and rendering himself up in grateful obedience to the Divine will. This is the running for which sin will fatally impede us. The aim of each must be, in familiar words, to do his duty in that state of life to which it shall please God to call him. Whether God shall call him to be married or to be single, to be a parent or to be childless, to serve an employer or to employ others, to work with his hands or with his head—in every state the Christian is to be loyal and diligent, fulfilling cheerfully as unto Christ the obligations of every condition. That is the race set before us.

4. And at every step of the onward course the loyal Christian will see the Lord Jesus Christ before him. We are to run with our eyes on 'Jesus, the author and perfecter of our faith.' We advance from faith unto faith. It is through Jesus the Son of God that we are persuaded to believe in the Father; by continually studying Him we are drawn into more assured trust, into more and more unreserved and satisfying surrender. The teachers of the first Christians, whose exhortations we read in the New Testament, had to be always thinking of them as undergoing or as likely to undergo persecution. In order that they might endure it patiently and with enthusiasm, they were bidden to look upon Jesus the Sufferer. If Jesus had suffered, why—they were bidden to ask themselves—should not *they* suffer? And if He had suffered on His way to a throne and a crown, might they not hope that, if they suffered with Him as His faithful followers and witnesses, they would also share His glory? There are sufferings now, trials small and great, continuous hardships, here and there overwhelming afflictions: but on the whole—so much has human life been bettered—we have to think of ourselves as more in danger from pleasure than from pain; and, this being the case, we have sometimes to change the key of the New Testament exhortations. Let those who have a happy or a very endurable life before them look no less unto Jesus, that they may be drawn by a powerful magnetism out of levity and frivolity, out of worldly ambition, out of illegitimate self-indulgence, out of careless or cowardly acquiescence in evil. Let them look unto Jesus, as unto the Lord to whom they hope to come nearer and nearer, in whose hand are the true leading-strings of the world, whose mind is

the law of all genuine progress. Christians have perhaps been too much in the habit of looking back to Jesus. He is in the past, certainly: a most touching figure, whether we bring Him to mind as the Babe of Bethlehem, or as the victim of malice and cruelty on the Cross; a commanding figure, when we listen to Him speaking to His followers or the multitudes or His persecutors with heavenly authority. But He is before us also, and the future should be illuminated to us by the grace and truth which shine triumphantly from Him.

We see by the glad light,
And breathe the sweet air, of futurity;
And so we live, or else we have no life.

It is our privilege to go forward in hope of the glory of God, to labour to bring both ourselves and the bit of the world around us into more thorough subjection to Christ.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Secret.

'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him.'—
Ps 25¹⁴.

The religious life—faith in God, the habitual consciousness of His presence, and the power of prayer or communion with Him—has a secret of its own. And it is a secret of a kind very hard indeed to reveal to anybody who seems to be without it. This natural reserve about religion also exists in relation to other things. All non-material pursuits have their secret too. Persons who are not addicted to intellectual habits may not easily perceive the delight of any one of them. Art too has its secret. And although music in some way or other is understood and cared for by more people than any other single branch of art, or by a larger number of people perhaps than any one branch of intellectual activity; yet there are intricacies of harmony and of orchestration presenting an extraordinary charm to those who understand them, but having no meaning whatever to the uninitiated. You cannot explain the beauty and the interest of that wonderful five-fugued chorus of Sebastian Bach to a person who cannot read music. It would be true then to say of it that its secret is with them that understand it, or that have been moved by it. The limitations of the individual understanding, or of the capacity for study, are somewhat sharply defined in several

subjects. Even if we had the capacity, life would be too short to master everything about them which has an interest for us. Religion, however, unlike any branch of art or any single department of the intellectual life, does from its very nature concern every human being, and is capable, to use a rather hackneyed phrase, of appealing to anybody. And yet, with all its universal concern and its unlimited appeal, it nevertheless has its secret. It not merely has its secret, but it is strangely distinguished by that very feature.

1. A secret sometimes means darkness, a closed door, something which is impenetrable, and therefore unlikely to be proved by language. But in the sense in which the Psalmist is understood to use the word, darkness is certainly not the meaning of it. It would seem to be used rather in the sense in which one might speak of the secret of some rare friendship. Two persons may be drawn together by an unspeakable tie of sympathy and affection. There is an affinity between them. Their opinions and their creed may be different, and they may have no tie of blood, and yet they have been drawn together through a long series of years, almost a lifetime, in a way that is not very common even among near relations. The secret of such a friendship is understood by themselves, and perhaps by no one else. 'What can he or she find in so-and-so to care so very much about?' the casual onlooker might remark. Yet it is a friendship which abides through all manner of changes in the conditions of either of them. The real secret in that case is of course love, whatever may have been the incidents or the accidents which first prompted the friendship.

2. But it is not often that we can find a true and tried friend into whose willing ear and sympathetic heart we can tell our deepest secrets, whether of joy or sorrow. We are not sufficiently acquainted with the carrying capacity of some of our friends; and whether in some way or other they may not damp our joys by some discordant criticism of their cause, or whether they may not deepen our sorrow by some incongruous flippancy. It is because true friends are so rare amongst our fellow-mortals that we are drawn into the warm sympathy and eternal security of the friendship of God, by whom the secrets of our hopes and fears, our joys and sorrows, are received with a father's tenderness, and kept to our honour and

well-being. What we commit to His trust, He is both able and willing to keep.

Confidence begets confidence, and the first to repose that confidence must be the weaker and the less wise. We are quick to detect, in the approaches of our bosom friend, that he is ready to congratulate us in our joys and condole with us in our sorrows; the disposition to receive our confidence and to deserve it is there, and we know it will not fail us. It is so with the Friend of all friends; if one diligently observes His coming—His approaches to us—they may soon discover that there are no pure joys in life and no real sorrows that are not His approaches, and that to observe them, respond to them, and open our heart, in the confidence of waiting and worshipping children, is to win His confidence in return.

'The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him, and he will shew them His *friendship*' (R.V. margin). It is this covenanting friendship which shows the human tendencies and tenderness in the character of the Divine Father, and seals, in outflowing love and compassion, His relationship with His children. He has many friends, even bosom friends, amongst His children—why should not all be?—and shows Himself friendly, speaking to them His words, disclosing His secret, and revealing His covenant.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

God's Abundance.

'Now unto him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think.'—Eph 3²⁰.

This man Paul excelled in many things, and in few things more than in letter-writing. All his epistles are remarkable; some of them are wonderful. One of the greatest marvels about them is this—that of all his letters the most spiritual, the most elevated and joyous, the most heart-touching and delightful are those which he wrote either while he was in a prison or had the gaoler's chain upon his arm. It seems as though when the gates of brass were shut around him the gates of gold were specially opened above him. It seems as though, when the keys of the gaoler locked him in, He who had the master-key at His girdle opened the door to let him out—out into the freedom and sunshine of those who, independent of circumstances, can walk and talk with God. Paul the prisoner becomes Paul the

prince of preachers and teachers, and his royalty impresses every page. Strange, is it not, that the chain upon his arm adds a charm to his pen? Now, if you were to ask him for an explanation of this strange scene—if you were to say, 'How is it, Paul, that you are so completely king of your surroundings—that the features of a prison take the graces of a palace—that a cheery song, worthy of a bright landscape and a blue sky, can be sung in the gloom of an iron cage? How is it?' I think that his answer would be, 'God is able to do exceeding abundantly above all I ask or think.' That grand truth inspired his soul, and took full possession of him, and so his heart and his hand kept time to the same beat. The pulse stroke and the pen stroke went in pairs; and if ever letter was written by a human hand that had an inspired human heart behind it, it is this transcendent epistle indited behind prison bars. It was Paul's lifelong joy to announce everywhere that the salvation of Jesus was free to all the world, and that the partition-wall between Jew and Gentile was broken down; and so he travelled everywhere, along all the European and Asiatic highways, offering to everybody, gentle and simple, the unsearchable riches of Christ.

1. Had the apostle only said that God is able to do all that we *ask*, his statement would have been enough to give us confidence in prayer. But it is a much more assuring thing to be told that God is able to do all we *think*. We may be limited in our asking by various causes. Timidity may cause us to limit our requests. Inability to embody our desires in words may prevent our asking the things we should like to receive. We can think them, but we cannot give expression to our thoughts so as to convert them into prayers. But here we are told that what things we can think, we are justified in expecting, for God is able to do not only all we ask but all we think. And this we may say confidently, that if our thoughts are in the line of the Spirit's teaching—if we think what is good, what is gracious, what is glorious, what is fitted to shed lustre on the Divine perfections, and to make them appear glorious in the eyes of God's creatures, what is fitted to minister to the blessedness and the true dignity of His chosen ones—we cannot think what is too great or too good for God to do, for He is able to do *all* that we ask or think.

2. But this is not all that the apostle says. The

Lord is not only able to do all that we ask or think, but *above* all, in excess of all, beyond all. Higher than our highest thought, His power to do reaches. Higher than the highest thought of any of His creatures. Paul's discursive, soaring mind, in its wide and lofty flights, may see wonderful things, things which it is not lawful for him to utter, because they so much surpass our present imaginings that they might shake our faith, if not becloud our reason. John's eagle *eye*, purged by pain, strengthened by devout meditations in the solitude of Patmos, lighted up by Divine inspiration, may see apocalyptic splendours which dazzle us by their brightness and their glory. But neither Paul's nor John's thinking can equal the Divine power to do. He is able to do above all that either Paul or John can ask or think.

3. Nor is it a bare surpassing even, to which the apostle testifies, as if God's power rose just above our thinking, and scarcely more; overtopping, but barely overtopping it. God's power is thus not nearly matched by man's thinking. 'He is able to do *abundantly* above all that we ask or think.' But even this is not all. Paul has a yet stronger word by which he gives intensity to all the others. Abundantly is not enough for him; there is something even beyond abundance. 'God is able to

do *exceeding* abundantly.' Further than this language cannot go. He might repeat himself, but he could scarcely intensify, even by repetition, what he has here said: 'Exceeding abundantly above all we ask or think.'

Sir Robert Ball tells us that the sun could heat and light two thousand million worlds like ours. Suppose a man to be left eight million pounds, and of that eight million to spend a penny wisely, but to waste and throw away all the rest, you would say of all the extravagant people you had ever heard of, he was the most spendthrift and extravagant. Well, Sir Robert Ball tells us that if eight million pounds' worth of heat emanated from the sun, we would not be able to secure and make use of on this earth more than the value of a pennyworth. There are other planets which use it, of course, but when every allowance is made for what they consume, there cannot be a doubt that by far the greater quantity of the heat and light given out by the sun is apparently wasted. It isn't needed in this world. Yet God made the universe on this tremendously liberal scale. Nothing is too great or too good for the man He has made. He withholds nothing from us—not even His Son—that He may show His love for us.

The Early Amorite King Humbaba.

BY PROFESSOR A. T. CLAY, PH.D., LITT.D., LL.D., YALE UNIVERSITY.

It is generally understood that in certain Aryan lands gods became men. Many scholars maintain that the same has occurred with the Semites. They have said that Nimrod, the patriarchs, and many other Biblical characters were originally deities; that Etana, Lugal Marda, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and many other Babylonian rulers had also descended from the realms of mythology. Fortunately clay tablets, which are not as perishable as skins and papyrus, have recently furnished us with the material whereby some of these so-called deities are restored to their places in dynastic lists, and whereby it is possible to assert that it cannot be proved that gods ever became mortals in the Semitic world. The order must be exactly reversed. While anthropomorphic ideas are attributed to the deities, we have no instance of a Semitic god

becoming a man. Perhaps it will be found that even more of the gods of Persia and India, who became mortals, had originally been human beings.

Etana has recently been restored to his place as a ruler in the earliest known dynasty, where he is called a 'shepherd.' The unpublished text in the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection, which figures in what follows, calls him 'king.' Lugal Marda, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and other rulers who had been deified, are now known to have been kings. From what follows, Humbaba, the despot with whom Gilgamesh fought, proves also to have been a human being, and to have been one of the earliest kings of the country later called Amurru, or the land of the Amorites. As a result there follow far-reaching and important conclusions as regards the early history and culture of this land.

The stronghold of Humbaba, with whom Gilgamesh fought as related in the epic bearing his name, has generally been located in the past in Elam; and it has also been generally held that the name is Elamitic. These conclusions have not rested upon the fact that cedar forests were known to have existed in Elam, for all the numerous references to cedars have been understood to refer to the Lebanon and Amanus ranges. The conclusions rested solely upon the slight resemblance of the name Humbaba to that of the Elamite god Humba, which is also written Humman, Humban, Umman, Umba, etc. The identification with this deity was also one of the reasons why emphasis was placed upon the Gilgamesh Epic being based upon a foundation of myth. A comparison of the name was made with Kombabos of the legend of Lucian concerning the building of the temple at Hieropolis, but the name continued to be identified with the Elamite god.¹ While others realized that the description of the cedars seemed to suggest the districts in the West, nevertheless the forests were considered to be in Elam.²

In the omen literature a word read *hu-pi-pi* occurs several times which has been regarded generally to be the name of an animal; and even has been translated 'hyena.'³ The same word occurs as a personal name in the early period. This word, strange to say, has also been regarded as an Elamitic loan-word, but on the basis of the reduplication of the final consonant.⁴

A few years ago an Amorite Name Syllabary was published, which contained *Hu-pi-pi*.⁵ The more recent discovery that in the Yale tablet of the old Babylonian version of the Gilgamesh Epic, the familiar name Humbaba is written exactly the same, showed that the correct reading of the word in the omen texts, and of the personal name, was not *Hu-pi-pi* but *Hu-wa-wa*, which reproduced the pronunciation of *Hu-ba-ba*. The name proved to be the same as that of Hobab, the brother-in-law of Moses (Nu 10²⁹); and it is unquestionably the same as Kombabos of Lucian.⁶ Furthermore, it naturally followed that the reference to the conflict

between Gilgamesh of Erech and Humbaba of the West was an allusion to an important historical event of the early period.⁷ Additional light is now thrown upon the situation from an omen text in the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection.

It is a well-established idea that the definite historical allusions to which omens refer were originally supplied by actual events that followed the appearance of the prognosticating signs which the priests had observed. Following are a few of the omens referring to historical events.

'If the foetus is male and female (a monstrosity); it is the omen of Bau-ellit, who ruled the land; the king's country will be seized.'⁸ It is now definitely known that this woman, Bau-ellit, overthrew the rule of Akshak, and established the fourth dynasty of Kish.

No less than eleven historical omens are known which bear upon Sargon's reign. In one of them the expression 'he possessed no foe nor rival,' meaning he had subdued the neighbouring lands, is fully borne out by many discoveries.

There are two well-known omens relating to Narâm-Sin, one referring to his overthrow of Apirak, and the other to his conquest of Magan. The former is summarized in the eighteenth line in the Morgan text, which reads: 'If the *tirani* is like a woolen rope; it is the omen of Narâm-Sin, who overthrew Apirak in arms.' This is fully confirmed by the chronicles of Babylonian kings.⁹

Another omen referring to the founder of a dynasty reads: 'If a sheep gives birth to an ox, etc., it is the omen of Ishbi-Urra, who did not have a rival.'¹⁰ We now have historical data to show that this Amorite, from the city of Mari, overthrew the third dynasty of Ur, and became the founder of the Nîsin dynasty.¹¹ These examples suffice to show that omens of this character unquestionably refer to historical events, and notably to great conquerors who overthrew dynasties, as well as to subjugating enemies.

The two omens referring to Huwawa have been known for some time; one reads: 'If a woman give birth to the face of Huwawa, the king and his sons will leave the city.'¹² The other is, 'If a sheep bear a lion, and it has the face of Huwawa, the prince will not have a rival; he will destroy

¹ Ungnad, *Das Gilgamesch-Epos*, p. 77.

² Gressmann, *ibid.* p. 111.

³ Holma, *Namen der Körperteile*, p. 152.

⁴ Weidner, *O.L.Z.* 17, p. 502.

⁵ Chiera, *Lists of Personal Names*, p. 122.

⁶ It is not improbable that Lucian's tradition contains a reflexion of the ancient Humbaba, who may have built or rebuilt the temple.

⁷ Clay, *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 88.

⁸ *C. T.* 28. 6 : 1 f.

⁹ King, *Chronicles*, i. 32 ff.

¹⁰ *C. T.* 27. 22 : 21.

¹¹ *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 107.

¹² *C. T.* 27. 3 : 17 = 4 : 9 = 6 : 4.

the land of the enemy.¹ In the omen text of the Pierpont Morgan Library Collection, this one is found in line 65: 'If the *tirani* is like the face of ^dHum. Hum, a usurper of the land will rule the world.' A fragment in the British Museum duplicates the first part of six consecutive lines of this text (*i.e.* 63 to 68), the third of which reads: 'If the *tirani* is like the face of Hum-ba-ba, etc.,'² showing that the ideogram ^dHum. Hum is to be read Humbaba. These omens can only be interpreted as meaning that Humbaba was a usurper, who, like Bau-ellit, Sargon, and Ishbi-Urra, overthrew a dynasty; conquered the lands; and was without a rival. The third interprets the other two; together they clearly indicate that Humbaba or Huwawa had been a mighty conqueror, and had doubtless subjugated Babylonia.

What the characteristic feature was which enabled the priests to associate the omen-sign with Huwawa is not clear. Jastrow has shown that Huwawa in omens is contrasted with *tigru*, 'dwarf.'³ The character of Humbaba is described in the Gilgamesh Epic as a *dapini*, 'terrible one,' 'whose roar is a deluge, whose mouth is fire, whose breath is death.' The elders in their efforts to dissuade Gilgamesh from attempting to overthrow him, asked, 'Who has ever penetrated to his dwelling-place or capital in the heart of the cedar forest?' 'Who has ever opposed his weapon?' In short, the references to the despot seem to convey the idea that he was a powerful personage.

Gilgamesh also figures in the divination texts; among which the following has been found. 'If a woman give birth, and the (child) has the head of a snake: (it is) the omen of Nin-Gish-Zid-da who ravaged the land; (and it is) the omen of Gilgamesh who ruled the land, and who became "the king of hosts" in the land.'⁴ It is clear from the Gilgamesh Epic, that Gilgamesh in the early part of his reign was subservient to another; and that he was able to overthrow his enemy.

The new chronological material bearing upon the early dynasties recently published, considered in connexion with all other data not known, gives us a fairly complete outline of historical events of

this early period.⁵ Following Mesh-kin-gasher and Enmer-kar, the first two kings of the early Erech dynasty, were Lugal Marda, Tammuz, and Gilgamesh. During the reigns of these kings we learn of contact with a great power in the West.

The so-called 'Legend of the Zu bird' acquaints us with the fact that an enemy designated as Zu, 'the storm bird,' not the 'personification of some solar deity,' but an invader who lived in an inaccessible distant mountain, had robbed Enlil of Nippur of his supremacy as 'lord of lands.' Lugal Marda, 'a shepherd,' came to the rescue, and succeeded in restoring Enlil to his position; for which he is in time credited with the title of 'Enlil of Kullab, Lugal Marda.'⁶ In pursuit of Zu, it was to the 'distant mountain Sâbu' that Lugal Marda went. Sâbu was in the Lebanon range.⁷ In other words, the enemy Zu represented an Amorite or West Semitic power which doubtless had invaded Babylonia.⁸ The so-called 'Legend of the Zu' was doubtless intended to commemorate the overthrow of this power by Lugal Marda.

Delitzsch years ago conjectured that the name Nimrod was from *Nu-Marad*, 'man of Marad.' More recently Kraeling suggested that the original form was *En-Marad*, standing for Lugal-Marad.⁹ If this 'shepherd' king should prove to be Nimrod, his Old Testament title, 'the mighty hunter,' or 'ensnarer,' may have reference to the strategy he employed in overthrowing the 'Zu bird.'

Lugal Marda is the most powerful king of this period at present known; and he is credited with having ruled longer than any other of his dynasty. The fragment of an historical text, recently published, shows that he conquered Halma (Aleppo) and Tidnum in the West; and it can be assumed that he ruled that land. This would give sufficient reason why his name should have been preserved in the traditions of the West. It is the only name of the Babylonian rulers of the early period that is preserved in the Old Testament. Moreover, his own habitat may originally have been in that land,

⁵ Poebel, *Historical Texts*, 88 ff.

⁶ Given as the explanation of a star; cf. Rawlinson, v. 46. 1: 27.

⁷ Jensen, *K.B.* vi. 1, p. 578; Zimmern, *K.A.T.*³ p. 574, note 3.

⁸ A city Su was identified with Mari (*C.T.* 25. 35, 24-27). On Su as an element in geographical names, cf. Delitzsch, *Paradies*, and *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 177.

⁹ See Prince's article *J.A.O.S.* 41, 201.

¹ *C.T.* 27. 21:8. See also *C.T.* 28. 14:12. Cf. also *Hu-um-ba-bi-tu*, *C.T.* 27:6=27. 4-8.

² Boissier, *Divination*, p. 91.

³ Religion, *Babyloniens*, ii. 913f.

⁴ *C.T.* 27. 1:8-9.

for his wife's name, although written in Sumerian, Nin-Sun,¹ was Semitic, namely, Rîmat-Bêlit; and her father bore the Amorite name Semak-Ur (Semachoros), a name like the Old Testament Semak-Jahu (Semachiah).²

Tammuz followed Lugal Marda as king of Erech. Babylonia had suffered another upheaval; Nun-Gish-Zid-da, 'his father, had ravaged the land,' as we learn from the omen. Besides this fact he is known only as a deity, with his habitat at Lagash. Doubtless he was king of that city.

Tammuz was not originally 'the personification of the son of the spring-time'; or 'the personification of some kind of wood'; but he was a human being, the fourth king of the early Erech dynasty.³

While legends concerning Tammuz (also called Adonis, etc.) and Ashirta (also called Astarte, Ashtaroth, 'Athar, 'Atar, Ashtar, Ishtar, Venus, Aphrodite, etc.) are of widespread origin, they are pre-eminently identified with Syria and the city of Erech in Babylonia. They cluster especially about a vale near Aphaca (Aphek, Jos 13⁴), at present represented by the modern Afka, at the head of the wild romantic wooded gorge of the Adonis river, in the Lebanon region, midway between Byblos and Ba'albec. Here tradition says the mangled body of the hunter was buried. Here are to be found many ruined monuments of his worship; one is that of a great temple of Astarte which Constantine destroyed. Another of the memorials that have kept the legends alive is now to be seen at Ghineh, where reliefs of Tammuz and Ashirta are carved upon the rocks. Tammuz is there portrayed with a spear awaiting an animal; while Ashirta is seated near by in a sorrowful attitude.⁴

The mother of Tammuz was named Zertu (also written Sirdu), which seems also to be Semitic. The name Tammuz was reproduced by two Sumerian words or ideograms, which represented the pronunciation, namely, Dumu-Zi, meaning 'faithful son'; but this is no proof that Tammuz was a Sumerian. His father's name, Nin-Gish-Zid-da, is also in a Sumerian dress; but this very

probably also represents a Semitic name. His having ruled at Lagash would fully account for his name being written Sumerian.

The city Ha-A, whence Tammuz came, has not been located; but his connexions with the legends of Syria, and especially because of the passage concerning him in a lamentation hymn, which reads, 'at the sacred cedar, a distant place where he was born' (or 'where his mother bore him'), points to the West as his birthplace.⁵ A number of passages show that he was worshipped at Hallab (Aleppo).⁶ Certainly his connexion with Ashirta and the West would imply that he was a Semite rather than a Sumerian. Moreover, he very probably met a premature death by drowning, which can be gathered from several passages, while associating, in the Lebanon region, with his contemporary Ashirta, perhaps a queen of Sheba or a Cleopatra of that era, who had her seat of government at Hallab.

The chief seat of the cult of Ashirta or Ishtar in Babylonia was at Erech; but Hallab seems to have been her home. In a lamentation hymn we have this passage: 'The queen of Erech for her husband; the queen of Hallab for her husband (wails).' This and other couplets, referring to Ishtar or to Tammuz and Ishtar, show that these two cities were intimately identified with each other.⁷ One of the earliest religious hymns known tells us she was from the land of Hallab.⁸ In the Gilgamesh Epic when she proposes to Gilgamesh, she says: 'Come, Gilgamesh, be thou my spouse. Present me with thy offspring; be thou my husband, let me be thy wife; and I will set thee in a chariot, etc. . . . Into our house under the fragrance of the cedar tree, enter. And when thou enterest our house [they shall place thee upon] a throne; they shall kiss thy feet.' In refusing her advances, Gilgamesh asked her what she had done with Tammuz and her other husbands; whereupon she told the god Anu that Gilgamesh had upbraided her on account of her evil deeds; and she asked for vengeance. Certainly, there is sufficient evidence to show that the Babylonians not only looked upon her as having been a mortal, but also that the West was her habitat. Moreover, since

¹ Instead of following certain scholars in translating *ri-im-tum ša su-pu-ri* ^d*Nin-Sun-na*, 'the wild cow of the stall, Nin-Sun,' this title of the mother-queen should be translated 'the beloved of the fortified city, Rîmat-Bêlit.' For Sun = *rimtu*, cf. *S.A.I.* 6727.

² *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 84.

³ Poebel, *Historical Texts*, p. 88.

⁴ Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, and Osiris*, i. p. 29.

⁵ *Empire of the Amorites*, p. 83.

⁶ *C.T.* 15, 26: 5.

⁷ Scheil, *R.A.* 8. 162, 4-5; *C.T.* 15. 19: 4-7; and *C.T.* 15, 26: 5-6, etc.

⁸ Barton, *Babylonian Inscriptions*, i. col. 13: 6.

Lugal Marda and his queen Nin-Sun, Nin-Gish-Zid-da and his queen Zerta, Tammuz, Gilgamesh, and Humbaba, all the kings and queens of this period were worshipped as deities, the suggestion that Ashirta, also called Ishtar, the wife of Tammuz, had also been a mortal, seems to the writer to be a perfectly reasonable conjecture. That the worship of this deified woman should have become so widespread, was doubtless due to the peculiarity of her cult which appealed to the sensuality of man. Throughout Syria, including Phœnicia and Canaan, the unspeakable abominations of her licentious cult took deep root. It was not so in Babylonia and Assyria, especially in the early period; for the one city which stands out peculiarly in having temple prostitutes is Erech. It is this fact which prompted Sayce long ago to say that 'Erech was essentially a Semitic city.'¹ In short, in consideration of all that we know of Erech's contact with the West, it is not difficult to understand how her cult migrated to Babylonia from that region.

Gilgamesh was not connected with the family of Tammuz, but with that of the latter's predecessor. He was the son of Rimat-Bêlit, the wife of Lugal Marda, and of the high priest of Kullab, a part of Erech, perhaps the Semitic quarter of that city. We are led to believe from the Epic of Gilgamesh that in the early part of his career Erech was subservient to another throne. Moreover, from the omen already referred to, we learn that one named Humbaba, who had usurped the throne of the West, had conquered the lands.

¹ *Gifford Lectures*, 1903, p. 342.

About this time another personage named Enkidu appeared on the scene, and became the ally of Gilgamesh. He 'had been reared in the mountains.' When the expedition to the West was being planned, he said to Gilgamesh, 'Know, my friend, when I moved about with the cattle in the mountain, I penetrated to a distance of a double measure into the heart of the (cedar) forest, where Huwawa lived.' The name En-ki-Du, although written in Sumerian, was very probably Semitic, Ea-ṭābu, or Ba'al-ṭōb;² and he was apparently another Western Semite. With his assistance Humbaba was overthrown, and Gilgamesh became 'king of hosts.' The epic bearing the name of Gilgamesh was originally written to commemorate that event.

If certain statements here presented are accepted as facts, namely, that Zu represents a power in the West; that the culture which existed at Hallab in the time of Tammuz, was Semitic; and that this ruler had relations with that city; that Humbaba, the contemporary of Gilgamesh (about 3900 B.C.), lived in the West land, and that he had humiliated Babylonia; then the thesis is unassailable that the history and culture of the country later designated as Amurru, 'the Land of the Amorites,' synchronize with the earliest known in Babylonia and Egypt. This being true, many prevailing theories concerning the Arabian origin of the Semites, Pan-Babylonism or the Babylonian origin of the Israel's culture and religion, etc., will need very considerable modification.

² Previously read Ea-bāni. The more ancient text reads Dú(g)=ṭābu, instead of Dú=bānu.

Contributions and Comments.

'In League with the Stones of the Field.'

SEVERAL explanations have been given of this phrase in Job 5²³, which may be seen in the older commentators; for example, A. B. Davidson's early commentary on Job. Modern interpreters generally take the meaning to be that the stones keep out of his field. So Dillmann, Duhm, Budde, Volz, Driver and Gray. The expression is, it must be

granted, somewhat curious, and it is not strange that the text has been questioned. Hence for 'stones,' 'lords' and 'sons' have been suggested, partly in reliance on ancient tradition. Dr. Bell prefers 'sons of the field,' translating the couplet:

Having league with the children of the field,
And the wild things being made thy friends.

He supposes that 'children of the field' is equivalent to 'the wild things,' the meaning being that the wild boar, the fox, etc., will no longer ravage

the fields and vineyards. Battenwieser follows Kohler in reading 'lords of the field,' that is, the elves or gnomes who belong to the same class as the satyrs.

I quote from my own comment in the *Century Bible* to lead up to the communication which it is the object of this note to bring before the reader :

'There runs through much of the Old Testament a deep sense of the sympathy between man and nature, which often finds expression in the prophetic descriptions of the happy future. Here the thought is poetically expressed that he need not fear famine (verse 22), for the stones will keep out of his field. It can surely hardly be meant that the very stones will bring forth corn and fruit, we might in that case compare Matt. iii. 9, iv. 3.'

I have received the following from the Rev. T. J. Chapman of the Rectory, Alcester :

'In your commentary on Job, *Century Bible*, I note your remarks on v.²³. It may interest you that a certain sheep station near Longreach in Queensland was the stoniest of all the stations I visited there. They varied in size up to that of a big turnip. When I remarked upon this peculiarity, the manager said the stones helped to grow the best grass anywhere, because they retained the heat after sundown and acted as a forcing-house on the grass.'

I do not know whether this confirms the general text or suggests the right interpretation, but I thought it sufficiently interesting to ask Mr. Chapman's permission to communicate it to the readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

ARTHUR S. PEAKE.

Manchester.

St. Matt. xxv. 36 ; 2 Tim. i. 16-18.

IN Mt 25³¹⁻⁴⁶ we have a description of the Judgment Day; and in the list of deeds of mercy for which the righteous are rewarded is the visitation of those in prison: 'I was in prison and ye came unto me.' There is surely a very distinct and unmistakable reference to this passage in 2 Tim¹⁶⁻¹⁸, where St. Paul mentions the kindness of Onesiphorus, who visited him in prison: 'He oft refreshed me and was not ashamed of my chain: but, when he was in Rome, he sought me out very diligently and found me. The Lord grant unto

him that he may find mercy of the Lord *in that day*.' In none of the commentaries which I have at hand is there the faintest allusion to what seems to me the remarkable and interesting fact that in this epistle there should be such a definite reference to the Gospel of St. Matthew. The date of 2nd Timothy is, I presume, A.D. 66 or 67, and evidently at that time the First Gospel was in current use.

JOHN WILLCOCK.

Lerwick.

Concerning the Name 'Paraclete.'

FOUND only (of Holy Writ) in the writings ascribed to St. John, the word 'paraclete' is rendered 'Advocate' in the First Epistle, but 'Comforter' in the Gospel. Yet παράκλητος is the exact equivalent of *advocatus*, and, like it, is a word of passive meaning, and it is never used in the classics or in Rabbinical writings except as meaning 'advocate'—that is to say, as meaning a third person called in to speak for a second person before a first.

The paraclete is one of three, not of two: one of these sits to hear a cause pleaded, one stands on trial before that first; and there is also this third party who is called in to answer for that second party and act the part of his advocate.

This being so, it seems scarcely permissible to accept (unless for devotional reading) the rendering 'Comforter' as satisfying and giving truly the sense of the Scripture in question.

The suggestion here diffidently offered would permit the student as such to read 'Advocate' for παράκλητος in the Gospel as in the Epistle. He would conceive of Christ Jesus in the days of His flesh as God's advocate with men—he would think of God as sending in Christ's name 'Another Advocate' to plead for Christ with the Church and the disciple (and, by the Church and the disciple, with the world and men). Our Lord did, in the days of His flesh, do the work of an advocate for the Father—giving men the truth about God, showing men the things of God, revealing God as He is in truth. He advocated God's cause and His claim on men; He vindicated God's ways with men and pled for belief in His Fatherhood, His impartiality, His nearness and forgivingness. He fulfilled that word, 'Let us reason together . . . let us plead together.' To the last, till we lost

sight of Him in the cloud of the ascension, Christ's face was turned to man as Apostle and Advocate for the Father.

As now ascended He appears in the presence of God for man, and His face is turned from us to the Father. Now He pleads not with us for God, but with God for us. But God is not left without an advocate in earth—'Another' is come who speaks and pleads for Christ, as Christ had pled and spoken for the Father. He is come for the sake of the Church and of the disciple, that we may have 'a right judgement in all things.' It is His office to take of the things of Christ and show them to us, and to lead us into their truth—to open our eyes to their beauty and persuade us of their truth. He answers for God that He is Love, answers for Christ that He is the Faithful and True: He pleads with the soul that it may believe good concerning God and His way, God and His Kingdom and His righteousness. It is of His

office in the Church and in the disciple, not speaking from Himself, to bring us in all things, as day follows day, to a right judgment.

Strange indeed is the tribunal if we consider the Pleader and the cause pleaded, but all this is work proper to an advocate, and for certain it is work which the Holy Spirit does. As for the world, upon it also the same Spirit acts, but, 'since the world receiveth him not, neither knoweth him'—upon it He works indirectly by the 'Spirit-bearing Body,' by the Spirit-bearing disciple (ambassadors on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating men by their voices). It is fact that our Lord stands trial anew before each new generation of mankind, and, also, even (*teste* Girton) within the Church of God; but Christ now has many witnesses, a multitude which no one could number, and His Advocate 'shall not fail.'

ARTHUR W. WOTHERSPOON.

Glasgow.

Entre Nous.

FOR THE MINISTRY.

Christian Mysticism.

The Right Rev. Arthur Chandler, formerly Bishop of Bloemfontein, now Rector of Bentley St. Mary, has written a book on Christian Mysticism, calling it *First-Hand Religion* (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net). Few men are better fitted. For he has a clear mind as well as a devout heart, and he writes with simplicity.

Let us see what he means by Mysticism.

1. First, then, God has made us in His image, and therefore there is a germ of the divine in us, which has to be developed into the knowledge and love of God. Nothing short of this knowledge and love of God can satisfy the soul that He has made. This is a truth which is verified in the experience of all, and which might be described as the bedrock foundation of religion.

2. Secondly, Christianity aims at unfolding and setting out the meaning of this knowledge and love of God, together with the service which these demand. And the significance of our religion will vary according to the way in which we appropriate it and work at it. For instance,

we can accept its teaching, and observe its rules of conduct, and experience feelings of love and gratitude to God, whilst these exercises of reason and will and heart are isolated in separate water-tight compartments, and not fused together into a living movement and attraction of the whole soul to God, a movement in which faith and love and works are inseparably combined.

And so, too, we can accept the Christian religion as a ready-made affair, which we take on trust, and which we feel no need or desire to verify for ourselves; we recognize that God has spoken in the Bible, and perhaps also in the Church, without expecting Him to speak in our own souls too.

This religion may be called conventional or second-hand, in the sense that it lacks the element of spiritual adventure, or the passionate quest of God by the united powers of the soul; and in the sense that it is not verified by that actual converse with God, and that living touch with Him, which would make it an actual first-hand experience of truth. But we must remember that such expressions as 'conventional' or 'second-hand' state the absence of certain qualities; they do not

deny the presence of other qualities. A man's religion may lack the note of mysticism and yet be earnest and firmly held, and bring great blessings on himself and others. It may be a type of religion which lays no great store by reflection or introspection, but it is often rich in good works and in the example of an unselfish and consistent Christian life. Perhaps 'extroverted' would be a better term to express it, because more free from any implication of disparagement. Such religion is not, indeed, turned inwards, as the mystic's is, but it is turned outwards to a loyal observance of God's commandments and to an exact fulfilment of the duties belonging to the state of life to which he has been called.

But at the same time it must be added that there is a great tendency for such religion to deteriorate, and to become conventional not only in the sense of being accepted ready-made or of consisting in a traditional routine of observances, but also in the sense of losing all vital significance, and becoming lifeless and unreal. And perhaps this danger is especially obvious in the Anglican Church. Our familiarity with set prayers and fixed forms of worship, the stereotyped iteration of exhortations like 'dearly beloved brethren,' combined sometimes with the droning monotony of a pulpit voice in the officiating minister; with the prominence often given to a form of service which makes little appeal to the imagination or the heart; and with the fact that priest and organist seem to conspire together to prevent our having a moment of silence in which to approach God quietly—all these things tend to have a deadening effect on the worship of God, which ought to be the very soul of religion. And when public worship becomes dull and lifeless, the rest of our religious life is apt to follow suit.

3. The third point is this. Mystical religion aims at the highest sort of reality—at converse with God, and union with God, Who is the sum and perfection of holiness and truth; therefore it is not a thing to be played with in a spirit of idle intellectual curiosity. It is not a matter for the intellect alone, but for the intellect in conjunction with the heart and will; it demands devotion and service as well as reasoning. If we take it up at all, we must be prepared to take trouble with it. In the first place, there must be a serious attempt at the mortification of self-will. The mystic is one who waits humbly upon God for indications of

His will; and he cannot do that unless he is really trying to get rid of self-will, self-seeking, self-assertion, in whatever way they are manifested: in the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eyes, or the pride of life. The spark of the divine which is in him must lead not only to dissatisfaction with earthly goods, but to mortification of the desire for them.

But the mortification of this comprehensive principle of pride and self-assertion is not an easy thing. Its antecedent condition is a thorough and honest repentance of past sin, with a readiness to do penance for it in the present; and its method of working is the resolute cutting off of the supplies of sin, and a resolute avoidance of occasions of sin. Repentance produces humility; mortification, or the gradual killing out of sin, produces freedom; and humility and freedom are essential parts of a mystic's outfit. He must be free to wait upon God in a humble readiness to do God's will.

And another thing that he wants, and which he will find it difficult to get, is patience and perseverance: Patience, the Queen of the Virtues, as S. Catherine of Siena calls it, who brings the virtues in her train. A very little experience tells us how sorely we need it; there are all sorts of discouragements; we seem to make no progress; a kind of false humility urges us to give up trying to do what is obviously too hard for us; whilst at other times presumption makes us want to attain to the goal at once, and tempts us to give up when we find that this cannot be done. We have to go on in dogged perseverance, being content at first with vague and confused ideas of God's will—vague because mixed up with unmortified notions of our own; gradually improving our methods; gradually relying more upon God, and less upon ourselves; gradually learning to control our imagination and fix our attention; gradually submitting ourselves more whole-heartedly to God's will, whatever that will may be; gradually rising from an appreciation of God's gifts to the love of Him who gives them, until the love of Him becomes the dominating power of our lives. Obviously, this is no light task; not one to be taken up as a fashionable fad, or an easy bit of occultism; it is one which demands the honest and strenuous dedication of a man's whole nature, and in particular the dedication of his will.

4. And now, fourthly, mysticism is an individual

type of religion; in that fact lies the secret alike of its strength and of its weakness, of its achievements and of its temptations. It is the individual soul's quest for God. The mystic enters upon that quest alone; alone he faces its difficulties: its adventures and discoveries are for him alone; he could not, if he would, communicate them to another; the contact of the soul with God is necessarily an ineffable experience.

This does not mean that the man isolates himself from his fellows; he may be closely engaged in business and in doing the duties that belong to him as a citizen and a Christian; but his religion is a very inward thing; its goal is an inward union of his soul with God, and the path is indicated by inward manifestations of God's directing will. And this fact, common to all mystical religion, necessarily involves dangers, and gives rise to a very common criticism.

Bishop Chandler proceeds to point out the dangers. But we need not follow him further. The book is sufficiently tested, both its science and its art, by the quotation already made. Dr. Chandler's books are always suggestive. Having thought, they create thought. And if they arrest occasionally they never disconcert in the end. The last point which he makes here is that Mysticism and the Church require each other.

SOME TOPICS.

McConnachie.

Before Sir James Barrie's Rectorial Lecture on *Courage* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. net) is forgotten, and in order that it may not be altogether forgotten, let us repeat some of its sentences:

'I have utterly forgotten the address of the Rector of my time, and even who he was, but I recall vividly climbing up a statue to tie his colours round its neck and being hurled therefrom with contumely. We remember the important things.'

'Never ascribe to an opponent motives meaner than your own. There may be students here to-day who have decided this session to go in for immortality, and would like to know of an easy way of accomplishing it. That is a way, but not so easy as you think. Go through life without ever ascribing to your opponents motives meaner than

your own. Nothing so lowers the moral currency; give it up, and be great.'

'Beware your betters bringing presents. What is wanted is something run by yourselves.'

'Carlyle, the king of all rectors, has always been accepted as the arch-apostle of toil, and has registered his many woes. But it will not do. Despite sickness, poortith, want and all, he was grinding all his life at the one job he revelled in. An extraordinarily happy man, though there is no direct proof that he thought so.'

'Henley says in that poem we were speaking of:

Under the bludgeonings of Chance
My head is bloody but unbowed.

A fine mouthful, but perhaps "My head is bloody and bowed" is better.'

'Don't forget to speak scornfully of the Victorian age; there will be time for meekness when you try to better it.'

And now let us convict Sir James Barrie of plagiarism. You remember McConnachie. Well, read this. It is a letter to his little girls by Joe Chandler Harris, the creator of Uncle Remus and Brer Rabbit. This is the letter: 'As for myself—though you could hardly call me a real, sure enough author—I never have anything but the vaguest ideas of what I am going to write; but when I take my pen in my hand the rust clears away, and the "other fellow" takes charge. You know all of us have two entities, or personalities. That is the reason you see and hear persons "talking to themselves." They are talking to the "other fellow." I have often asked my "other fellow" where he gets all his information, and how he can remember, in the nick of time, things that I have forgotten long ago; but he never satisfies my curiosity. He is simply a spectator of my folly until I seize a pen, and then he comes forward and takes charge.

'Sometimes I laugh heartily at what he writes. If you could see me at such times, and they are very frequent, you would no doubt say, "It is very conceited in that old man to laugh at his own writing." But that is the very point; it is not my writing at all; it is my "other fellow" doing the work and I am getting all the credit for it. Now, I'll admit that I write the editorials for the paper. The "other fellow" has nothing to do with them, and, so far as I am able to get his views on the

subject, he regards them with scorn and contempt; though there are rare occasions when he helps me out on a Sunday editorial. He is a creature hard to understand, but, so far as I can understand him, he's a very sour, surly fellow until I give him an opportunity to guide my pen in subjects congenial to him; whereas I am, as you know, jolly, good-natured, and entirely harmless.

'Now, my "other fellow," I am convinced, would do some damage if I didn't give him an opportunity to work off his energy in the way he delights. I say to him, "Now, here's an editor who says he will pay well for a short story. He wants it at once." Then I forget all about the matter, and go on writing editorials and taking Celery Compound, and presently my "other fellow" says sourly: "What about that story?" Then when night comes, I take up my pen, surrender unconditionally to my "other fellow," and out comes the story, and if it is a good story I am as much surprised as the people who read it. Now, my dear gals will think I am writing nonsense; but I am telling them the truth as near as I can get at the facts—for the "other fellow" is secretive. Well! so much for that. You can take a long breath now and rest yourselves.'

The Preacher as Scholar.

This is from the Hartley Lecture of Mr. Pickett (a Primitive Methodist preacher):

'Before and beyond any intellectual attainment, the work of preaching presupposes seclusion with Jesus. This always first and chief. The "laying on of hands" that matters, the really valid ordination, is the pressure of the "hands pierced for us." Nor, until we know and feel the steady and constant impact of His personality upon our own, waiting in profound reverence for Him as lovers, living with Him in the secret places of His love, can we expect to know His mind, or understand the treasures of grace He desires us to make known to others.

'This is not to undervalue the work of the study, nor is it to depreciate the place of true scholarship. It is rather to offer to that side of the preacher's work an unflinching incentive. It is deeply and permanently true, that the longing for, and the effort to secure the highest intellectual efficiency, will be in exact proportion to the intensity and

fulness of our love for the Person of Jesus. To be "with Him" makes the preacher evermore a student, and always a student of the highest and best. The effective antidote against intellectual stagnation is abiding fellowship with Jesus. The true goad to study is the Apostle's longing to "know Him, and the power of His resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings." And in all this, since Jesus has declared, "Lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world," the twelve possessed no advantage not equally open to disciples still, with all it involves of inquiry, explanation, correction, and ever-expanding vision.'

Now take this from Professor George Jackson's *Reasonable Religion*. Dr. Jackson quotes from Forbes Robinson's *Letters to his Friends*: 'I have been reading out here two very different kinds of books. One is Wellhausen's *History of Israel*, the other Moody's *Life*, by his son. Wellhausen's book gives you in outline the position of modern advanced criticism of the Old Testament. I have never before studied the history from the critical point of view really seriously. The study has proved extraordinarily interesting, and I must say that in the main I agree thoroughly with Wellhausen's position. . . . Moody's *Life* stirs me up to realise more the worth of the individual, the surpassing value of man's moral and spiritual nature.'

Then Dr. Jackson comments: 'Wellhausen and Moody—that is a very suggestive collocation, and it is not too much to say that the power of the pulpit in the days that lie immediately ahead of us will depend in no small degree on our success in yoking together the forces respectively represented by the German scholar and the American evangelist. To have the scholar and the evangelist for ever working at cross purposes is to sterilise all the Church's best endeavour. The evangelist who is afraid of scholarship has only a maimed Gospel, which will only commend itself to maimed men. Scholarship without an evangel is as futile as the wheeling of swallows round the church steeple.'

Proverbs.

Under the title of *Wayside Sayings*, Selwyn Gurney Champion and Ethel Mavrogordato have issued a volume of Proverbs (Duckworth; 5s. net). 'In the preparation of the present collection of Proverbs,' they say, 'we have endeavoured to

accumulate only those sayings which are comparatively little known and which are in danger of falling into disuse. The more ordinary or commonplace proverbs have not been included.' And they say so most truly. Here are proverbs innumerable which you never heard or read before, and many of them are as pithy as prudent. The curious thing about proverbs is that there is no religion in them, and rarely even any idealism. They are of the earth earthy. As a guide of life they are utterly unreliable. Some of them have the cynical sordidness of Satan.

Our authors divide their proverbs into nationalities. Let us test them by a few examples:

- English.* 'There is but an hour a day between a good housewife and a bad.'
- Irish.* 'There is no overtaking the shot once fired.'
- Scotch.* 'Choose a good mother's daughter, though her father were the devil.'
- American.* 'There are two sides to every question—the wrong side and our side.'
- Egyptian.* 'A borrowed cloak does not keep one warm.'
- Arabian.* 'God bless him who pays visits—and short visits.'
- Japanese.* 'No standing in the world without stooping.'
- Chinese.* 'Forethought is easy, repentance is hard.'
- Spanish.* 'To steal the pig, and give away the feet for God's sake.'

A TEXT.

Job xxxiii. 15.

'The Hebrew writers had great respect for dreams. "In a dream," says the *Book of Job*, "in a vision of the night . . . then he openeth the ears of men, and sealeth their instruction.' The Greeks thought dreams a source of wisdom; Synesius in his *Treatise on Dreams* declares that attention to divination by dreams is good on moral grounds alone. Jonathan Edwards, who by the way was a typical mystic and seer, having trance-like states under the stress of religious feeling, especially in the presence of nature, says in his *Diary*: "I think it a very good way to examine dreams every morning when I awake; what are

the nature, circumstances, principles, and ends of my imaginary actions and passions in them, to discern what are my chief inclinations, etc." Kant in his *Anthropology* thinks dreams of value "in laying bare for us our hidden dispositions, and revealing to us not what we are, but what we might have been if we had had a different education."

'These quotations represent the classical and older view. At present dreams are apt to be dismissed as trifles, or discussed as merely physiological or pathological. Unquestionably dreams may follow indigestion, but they have other bearings too; and it is well to heed Charles Lamb, who takes the older view. "Some people," he says, "have no good of their dreams. Like fast feeders, they gulp them too grossly, to taste them curiously. . . . We have too much respect for these spiritual communications to let them go so lightly. . . . They seem to us to have as much significance as our waking concerns; or rather to import us more nearly, as more nearly as approach by years to the shadowy world, whither we are hastening. . . . It is good to have friends at court. The abstracted media of dreams seem no ill introduction to that spiritual presence, upon which, in no long time, we expect to be thrown. . . . Therefore we cherish dreams. We try to spell in them the alphabet of the invisible world; and think we know already how it shall be with us."

'We may believe then, if we take this older view, that dreams not only reveal to us our own deeper character, but draw from these deeper sources moral wisdom, truth not ascertainable by our conscious waking minds, even truths touching the life of the spirit and immortality. But these are the truths which the poets and mystics are always seeking.

Waking or asleep,
They of death must deem
Things more true and deep
Than we mortals dream.'¹

¹ F. C. Prescott, *The Poetic Mind*, p. 26 f.